arXiv:1610.04293v1 [math.PR] 13 Oct 2016

# The social network model on infinite graphs

Jonathan Hermon * Ben Morris † Chuan Qin Allan Sly ‡

**Abstract**

Given an infinite connected regular graph $G = (V, E)$, place at each vertex Pois($\lambda$) walkers performing independent lazy simple random walks on $G$ simultaneously. When two walkers visit the same vertex at the same time they are declared to be acquainted. We show that when $G$ is vertex-transitive and amenable, for all $\lambda > 0$ a.s. any pair of walkers will eventually have a path of acquaintances between them. In contrast, we show that when $G$ is non-amenable (not necessarily transitive) there is always a phase transition at some $\lambda_c(G) > 0$. We give general bounds on $\lambda_c(G)$ and study the case that $G$ is the $d$-regular tree in more details. Finally, we show that in the non-amenable setup, for every $\lambda$ there exists a finite time $t_\lambda(G)$ such that a.s. there exists an infinite set of walkers having a path of acquaintances between them by time $t_\lambda(G)$.

**Keywords:** Social network, percolation, random walks, infinite cluster, amenability.

*Department of Statistics, UC Berkeley, USA. E-mail: jonathan.hermon@stat.berkeley.edu.
†Department of Mathematics, UC Davis, USA. E-mail: morris@math.ucdavis.edu.
‡Department of Statistics, UC Berkeley, USA. E-mail: sly@stat.berkeley.edu .

# 1 Introduction

We consider the following model for a social network which we call the **social network model** (SN as a shorthand). The model was proposed by Itai Benjamini and was first investigated in [3] in the context of finite graphs (see § 1.2 for further details). In this work we study the model on infinite graphs. Let $G = (V, E)$ be an infinite connected $d$-regular graph, which is the underlying graph of the SN model. In our model we have walkers performing independent lazy simple random walks on $G$, denoted by ***LSRW*** (see § 2 for a definition). The walkers perform their LSRWs simultaneously (i.e. at each time unit they all perform one step, which may be a lazy step). The SN model on a graph $G$ with density $\lambda > 0$ is defined by setting $(|\mathcal{W}_v|)_{v\in V}$ to be i.i.d. Pois($\lambda$) r.v.'s, where $\mathcal{W}_v$ denotes the set of walkers whose initial position is $v$. We denote the corresponding probability measure by $\mathrm{P}_\lambda$.

Let $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$. We say that two walkers $w, w'$ have ***met by time*** $t$, which we denote by $w \overset{t}{\leftrightarrow} w'$, if there exists $t_0 \le t$ such that they have the same position at time $t_0$. After two walkers meet they continue their walks independently without coalescing. We write $w \overset{\infty}{\leftrightarrow} w'$ ("meeting by time $\infty$"), if there exists some finite $t$, such that $w \overset{t}{\leftrightarrow} w'$. "Meeting by time $t$" is a symmetric relation and thus induces a unique minimal equivalence relation that contains it. We call this equivalence relation ***having a path of acquaintances by time*** $t$ and denote it by $\overset{t}{\sim}$ (note that $w \overset{\infty}{\sim} w'$ iff there exists some finite $t$ such that $w \overset{t}{\sim} w'$). More explicitly, two walkers $a$ and $b$ have a path of acquaintances by time $t$ iff there exist $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and walkers $a = c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_k, c_{k+1} = b$ such that $c_i \overset{t}{\leftrightarrow} c_{i+1}$, for all $0 \le i \le k$. Note that we are not requiring the sequence of times in which the walkers met to be non-decreasing, which is the main difference between the SN model and some existing models from spread of rumor/infection (e.g. the $A + B \to 2B$ model [8] and the Frog model [13, 1, 11, 6])). Consequently, the SN model typically evolves much faster than such models.

We are interested in the coalescence process of the equivalence classes, and in particular in the number of equivalence classes of $\overset{\infty}{\sim}$ and in the existence of an infinite equivalence class of $\overset{t}{\sim}$ for some finite $t$.

Let $\mathcal{W} := \cup_{u\in V}\mathcal{W}_u$ be the set of all walkers. Denote by **Con** (a shorthand for "connected") the event that $w \overset{\infty}{\sim} w'$ for all $w, w' \in \mathcal{W}$ (i.e. **Con** is the event that every pair of walkers eventually have a path of acquaintances between them). The following question was proposed to us by Itai Benjamini [2].

**Question 1.1.** *Let $\mathbb{T}_d$ be the infinite $d$-regular tree. Does $\mathrm{P}_\lambda[\mathbf{Con}] = 1$ for all $\lambda > 0$?*

We give a negative answer to this question (Theorem 2). This raises the problem of identifying for which graphs **Con** occurs $\mathrm{P}_\lambda$-a.s. for all $\lambda > 0$.

**Definition 1.2** (critical density)**.** *Let $G = (V, E)$ be an infinite connected regular graph. The* critical density *for the SN model on $G$ is defined to be*

$$\lambda_c(G) := \inf\{\lambda : \exists p > 0 \text{ such that for all } w, w' \in \mathcal{W}, \mathrm{P}_\lambda[w \overset{\infty}{\sim} w'] \ge p\}.$$

For more details see (1.3). The following phase transition occurs around the critical density:

**Proposition 1.3.** *Let $G$ be an infinite connected regular graph. Then*

$$\mathrm{P}_\lambda[\mathbf{Con}] = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } 0 \le \lambda < \lambda_{\mathrm{c}}(G), \\ 1 & \text{if } \lambda > \lambda_{\mathrm{c}}(G). \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

A graph $G = (V, E)$ is called *(vertex) transitive* if the action of its automorphisms group, $\mathrm{Aut}(G)$, on its vertices is transitive (i.e. $\{\phi(v) : \phi \in \mathrm{Aut}(G)\} = V$ for all $v$). The spectral radius of a random walk on $G = (V, E)$ with transition matrix $P$ is $\rho := \limsup_n (P^n(v, u))^{1/n}$ (the limit is independent of $u, v \in V$). A graph $G$ is called *amenable* if $\rho = 1$ for LSRW on $G$ (otherwise, it is called *non-amenable*). We review some consequences of amenability/non-amenability in Sections 2.5 and 4. There are numerous characterizations of amenability. Most characterizations describe a certain dichotomy between amenable graphs and non-amenable graphs. In particular, several probabilistic models exhibit very different behaviors in the amenable setup and the non-amenable setup. However, proving a sharp dichotomy may be an extremely challenging task for some models. For instance, it is a major open problem in percolation theory to establish that for transitive graphs, the existence of a non-uniqueness regime for Bernoulli percolation is equivalent to non-amenability (for further details see [10, Chapter 7]). The following theorem asserts that for transitive graphs, amenability can be characterized by the SN model (note that there is no transitivity assumption in the non-amenable setup).

**Theorem 1.** *For every infinite connected transitive amenable graph of finite degree $\lambda_{\mathrm{c}} = 0$. Conversely, for every infinite non-amenable connected regular graph $\lambda_{\mathrm{c}} > 0$.*

**Remark 1.4.** *A similar dichotomy is believed to hold for the frog model (in the context of recurrence), however the only family of non-amenable graphs for which a phase transition is known to exist in the frog model is the infinite $d$-regular tree for all $d \ge 3$ [7]. The frog model in the amenable setup is studied in [12].*

**Remark 1.5.** *Using our analysis of the non-amenable setup it is not hard to verify that by attaching the root of an infinite binary tree to the origin of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ we obtain a non-transitive amenable graph with $\lambda_{\mathrm{c}} > 0$. Thus the transitivity assumption is necessary in Theorem 1.*

A question which arises naturally is what can be said about $\lambda_{\mathrm{c}}$ in the non-amenable setup. We give general lower and upper bounds on $\lambda_{\mathrm{c}}(G)$ (Theorems 5.1 and 6.1, resp.) in terms of the spectral radius of the walks on $G$ ($\rho$) and its degree $d$. It turns out that the holding probability (which obviously affects $\rho$) can drastically change $\lambda_{\mathrm{c}}$, which is somewhat counter-intuitive at first sight. As an illustrating example we consider the infinite $d$-regular tree.

**Theorem 2.** *Let $\mathbb{T}_d = (V, E)$ be the infinite $d$-regular tree for some $d \ge 3$. There exist absolute constants $c, C > 0$ such that when the holding probability of the walks is taken to be $1/(d+1)$ we have that*

$$c\sqrt{d} \le \lambda_{\mathrm{c}}(\mathbb{T}_d) \le C\sqrt{d}. \tag{1.2}$$

In contrast, it follows from Theorem 6.1 that when the holding probability is taken to be $1/2$ we have that $\lambda_{\mathrm{c}}(\mathbb{T}_d) \le C \log d$ (in fact, when the holding probability is $1/2$, one can refine Theorem 5.1 and obtain as a corollary that $\lambda_{\mathrm{c}}(\mathbb{T}_d) \ge c \log d$)

### 1.1 Infinite friend clusters in finite time

We now turn our attention to the problem of determining the existence of an infinite equivalence class of $\overset{t}{\sim}$ for some finite $t$.

Let $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$. For each walker $w$ we call the set walkers in the same equivalence class of $\overset{t}{\sim}$ as $w$, the ***friend cluster*** of $w$ ***at time*** $t$ and denote it by $\mathrm{FC}_t(w)$. When $t = \infty$ we call this set the ***friend cluster*** of $w$ and denote it by $\mathrm{FC}(w) := \mathrm{FC}_\infty(w)$. More generally, when $t = \infty$ we often omit it from our terminology and notation. For $u, v \in V$ and $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$ we denote $u \overset{t}{\leftrightarrow} v$ and $u \overset{t}{\sim} v$ iff there exist $w \in \mathcal{W}_u$ and $w' \in \mathcal{W}_v$ so that $w \overset{t}{\leftrightarrow} w'$ and $w \overset{t}{\sim} w'$, resp.. Let $\Xi := \{u \in V : |\mathcal{W}_u| > 0\}$. It will be convenient to define the friend cluster of a vertex $u$ at time $t$, which by abuse of notation we denote by $\mathrm{FC}_t(u)$, which is defined as follows. If $u \in \Xi$ then we define $\mathrm{FC}_t(u)$ to be the friend cluster of the walkers in $\mathcal{W}_u$ at time $t$, i.e. $\mathrm{FC}_t(u) := \mathrm{FC}_t(w)$ for some $w \in \mathcal{W}_u$. Otherwise, we set $\mathrm{FC}_t(u)$ to be the empty-set. Note that

$$\lambda_{\mathrm{c}}(G) = \inf\{\lambda : \exists p > 0 \text{ such that for all } u, v \in V, \mathrm{P}_\lambda[\mathrm{FC}(u) = \mathrm{FC}(v) \mid u, v \in \Xi] \geq p\}. \quad (1.3)$$

Minor adjustments to the analysis of the SN model on $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^d$ from [3] show that (in the continuous-time setup) when the underlying graph is $\mathbb{Z}^d$ ($d > 1$), for every $\lambda > 0$ there is indeed an infinite friend cluster in finite time a.s..

**Conjecture 1.6** (Benjamini [2])**.** *Let $G$ be an infinite connected graph of bounded degree. Assume that for some $0 < p < 1$ Bernoulli bond percolation on $G$ with survival probability $p$ has an infinite connected component with probability 1. Then for all $\lambda > 0$, there exists $t_\lambda(G) > 0$ such that*

$$\mathrm{P}_\lambda[\max_w |\mathrm{FC}_{t_\lambda(G)}(w)| = \infty] = 1.$$

The following theorem provides a partial answer.

**Theorem 3.** *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a regular connected infinite non-amenable graph. Denote the spectral radius of LSRW with some arbitrary holding probability $0 \leq p < 1$ by $\rho$. Let $\mathrm{IC}(t)$ be the event that $\max_{v \in V} |\mathrm{FC}_t(v)| = \infty$. Then there exists an absolute constant $C > 0$ (independent also of $G$) such that for all $\lambda \in (0, 1]$ and $t \geq \lceil \frac{C}{\lambda(1-\rho)} \rceil =: t_{C,\lambda}$*

$$\mathrm{P}_\lambda[\mathrm{IC}(t)] = 1.$$

**Remark 1.7.** *Theorem 6 in [3] asserts that (for $\lambda = 1$) if $G$ is a $d$-regular expander of size $n$, then there exists some constants $t, c_2$ (depending only on the spectral gap of the walk on $G$ and on $d$) such that after $t$ steps $\max_v |\mathrm{FC}(v)| \geq n/6$ with probability at least $1 - e^{-c_1 n}$. However, the techniques from the finite setup do not carry over to the infinite setup of Theorem 3.*

### 1.2 Related work

The SN model, proposed by Itai Benjamini, was first investigated in the context of finite graphs and $\lambda = 1$ in [3], where it was shown that there exist constants $c, C_d > 0$ such that for every finite connected graph $G = (V, E)$ of maximal degree $d$,

$$\mathrm{P}[c \log |V| \leq \inf\{t : \mathrm{FC}_t(u) = \mathrm{FC}_t(v) \text{ for all } u, v \in \Xi\} \leq C_d \log^3 |V|] \geq 1 - |V|^{-1}.$$

In [3] it is shown that for a $d$-dimensional torus of side length $n$ with $d \geq 2$ (when the walkers perform independent rate 1 continuous-time SRWs) there exists a constant $t_d$ such that w.h.p. $\max_v |\mathrm{FC}_{t_d}(v)| \geq c_d n^d$. With minor adjustments, this result could be extended to $\mathbb{Z}^d$ for all $\lambda > 0$, where $t_d$, $c_d n^d$ and w.h.p. are replaced by $t_{d,\lambda}$, $\infty$ and a.s., resp.. That is, $\mathrm{P}_\lambda$-a.s. there exists some $v \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $|\mathrm{FC}_{t_{d,\lambda}}(v)| = \infty$ (in the continuous-time setup).

## 2 Preliminaries and additional notation

LSRW is defined as follows. If a walker's current position is $v$, then the walker either stays in its current position w.p. $1/2$, which we refer to as the *holding probability*, or moves to one of the neighbors of $v$ w.p. $\frac{1}{2d}$. We shall also consider the case of holding probability $1/(d+1)$ in which $1/(2d)$ and $1/2$ above are both replaced by $1/(d+1)$.

### 2.1 Reversibility, Poisson thinning, stationarity of the occupation measure and independence of the number of walkers performing different walks.

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a regular graph. Then by *reversibility* the transition kernel $P$ of LSRW on $G$ is symmetric. We now establish a certain independence property for walks in $G$, which in particular implies a certain stationarity property of the SN model. A ***walk*** of length $k$ in $G$ is a sequence of $k+1$ vertices $(v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_k)$ such that for all $0 \leq i < k$ either $v_i = v_{i+1}$ or $\{v_i, v_{i+1}\} \in E$. Let $\Gamma_k$ be the collection of all walks of length $k$ in $G$. We denote the set of walkers whose initial position is $v$ by $\mathcal{W}_v := \{w_1^v, \ldots, w_{N_v}^v\}$. We denote by $\mathbf{w}_i^v(t)$ the position of the walker $w_i^v$ at time $t$. We say that a walker $w_i^v$ performed a walk $\gamma \in \Gamma_k$ if $(\mathbf{w}_i^v(0), \ldots, \mathbf{w}_i^v(k)) = \gamma$. For a walk $\gamma = (\gamma(0), \ldots, \gamma(k)) \in \Gamma_k$ for some $k \geq 1$, we denote $p(\gamma) := \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} P(\gamma_i, \gamma_{i+1})$. This is precisely the probability that some given walker $w \in \mathcal{W}_{\gamma(0)}$ performed the walk $\gamma$. Let $\gamma_{\mathrm{rev}}$ be the reversal of $\gamma \in \Gamma_k$. That is $\gamma_{\mathrm{rev}}(i) = \gamma(k-i)$ for all $0 \leq i \leq k$. Then by reversibility $p(\gamma) = p(\gamma_{\mathrm{rev}})$. We denote the number of walkers who performed a walk $\gamma$ by $X_\gamma$. We denote the number of walkers whose position at time $t$ is $v$ by $Y_v(t)$. By reversibility, for all $v \in V$ and $t > 0$ we have $\mathbb{E}_\lambda[Y_v(t)] = \lambda \sum_{u \in V} \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_t : \gamma_0 = u, \gamma_t = v} p(\gamma) = \lambda \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_t : \gamma_0 = v} p(\gamma) = \lambda$. Thus by Poisson thinning:

**Fact 2.1.** *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a regular graph. For every $\lambda > 0$, under $\mathrm{P}_\lambda$ we have that for all $t > 0$ and $\gamma \in \Gamma_t$, $X_\gamma \sim \mathrm{Pois}(\lambda p(\gamma))$. Moreover, for each fixed $t > 0$, $(X_\gamma)_{\gamma \in \Gamma_t}$ are independent. Consequently, for each fixed $t > 0$, $(Y_v(t))_{v \in V}$ are* i.i.d. $\mathrm{Pois}(\lambda)$.

### 2.2 A formal construction of the SN model

Let $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$. The ***acquaintances graph*** at time $t$, denoted by $\mathrm{AC}_t(G) = (V, E_t)$, is a random graph in which two distinct vertices $u, v \in V$ are connected by an edge iff $u \overset{t}{\leftrightarrow} v$. We denote $\mathrm{AC}(G) := \mathrm{AC}_\infty(G)$. We denote the connected component of $v$ in $\mathrm{AC}_t(G)$ by $C_t(v)$. Note that $\mathrm{FC}_t(v) = \bigcup_{u \in C_t(v)} \mathcal{W}_u$. When clear from context, we omit $G$ from the notation. When we want to emphasize the identity of the density of the walkers we write $\mathrm{AC}_t^\lambda(G)$.

**Proposition 2.2.** *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a regular graph. There exists a probability space on which the SN model on $G$ is defined for all $\lambda > 0$ simultaneously, such that deterministically, for all $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$ we have that $\mathrm{AC}_t^{\lambda_1}$ is a subgraph of $\mathrm{AC}_t^{\lambda_2}$ for all $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2$.*

*Proof.* For every $v \in V$ let $M_v(t)$ be a homogeneous Poisson process on $\mathbb{R}_+$ with rate 1 (all of which defined on the same probability space so that they are independent). For each $\lambda > 0$, when the density of walkers is taken to be $\lambda$, we take $|\mathcal{W}_v^\lambda| := M_v(\lambda)$, where $\mathcal{W}_v^\lambda$ denotes the the set of walkers whose initial position is $v$ (in the case of density $\lambda$). Thus if $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$ then for all $v \in V$ we have that $\mathcal{W}_v^{\lambda_1} \subset \mathcal{W}_v^{\lambda_2}$. The assertion of the Proposition is already clear at this point. For the sake of completeness, we give additional details concerning the construction.

We continue by constructing at each site $v$ an infinite collection of independent walks, where in practice, only $M_v(\lambda)$ of them shall be involved in the dynamics associated with the SN model with density $\lambda$. For each $v \in V$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathbf{w}_n^v = (\mathbf{w}_n^v(t))_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ be a LSRW on $G$, started at $v$ (throughout we denote the law of such a walk by $\mathbb{P}_v$, where the holding probability is either clear from context or irrelevant). We take all the walks to be independent. Moreover, we take $\mathbf{W} := (\mathbf{w}_n^v)_{n \in \mathbb{N}, v \in V}$ and $\mathbf{M} := (M_v)_{v \in V}$ to be independent. We think of $\mathbf{w}_n^v$ as the walk performed by the $n$-th particle whose initial position is $v$.

We are now in the position to define $\mathrm{AC}_t^\lambda := (V, E_{t,\lambda})$. Denote by $Z_{i,j}^{u,v}(t)$ the indicator of the event that the $i$-th particle from $u$ met the $j$-th particle from $v$ by time $t$ (i.e. $Z_{i,j}^{u,v}(t) := 1_{\mathbf{w}_i^u(s) = \mathbf{w}_j^v(s) \text{ for some } s \le t}$). We want the last event to imply that $\{u, v\} \in E_{t,\lambda}$ iff $i \le |\mathcal{W}_u^\lambda| = M_u(\lambda)$ and $j \le |\mathcal{W}_v^\lambda| = M_v(\lambda)$ (because we want the number of particles starting at each site which are involved in the dynamics to have a Pois($\lambda$) distribution). Hence we define $Q_{u,v}^{(\lambda)}(t) = \max\{Z_{i,j}^{u,v}(t) : i \le |\mathcal{W}_u^\lambda|, j \le |\mathcal{W}_v^\lambda|\}$ (this is the indicator of the event that some $w \in \mathcal{W}_v^\lambda$ met by time $t$ some $w' \in \mathcal{W}_u^\lambda$) and set $\{u, v\} \in E_{t,\lambda}$ iff $Q_{u,v}^{(\lambda)}(t) = 1$. □

**Lemma 2.3.** *(Regeneration Lemma) Let $G = (V, E)$ be an infinite $d$-regular graph. Let $A \subset V$ be a finite set. Denote the set of walkers whose initial position is in $A$ by $\mathcal{W}_A := \bigcup_{a \in A} \mathcal{W}_a$. Let $Y_{v,\bar{A}}(t)$ be the number of walkers not belonging to $\mathcal{W}_A$ which are at vertex $v$ at time $t$. Then for each fixed $t$, $(Y_{v,\bar{A}}(t))_{v \in V}$ are independent Poisson r.v.'s with $\lim_{t \to \infty} \inf_v \mathbb{E}_\lambda[Y_{v,\bar{A}}(t)] = \lambda$.*

*Proof.* The independence and the fact that the marginal distributions are Poisson follows from Poisson thinning. Let $Y_{v,A}(t)$ be the number of walkers from $\mathcal{W}_A$ which are at vertex $v$ at time $t$. Denote $P(v, A) := \sum_{a \in A} P(v, a)$. By reversibility, $\mathbb{E}_\lambda[Y_{v,A}(t)] = \lambda P^t(v, A)$ and so

$$\lambda - \mathbb{E}_\lambda[Y_{v,\bar{A}}(t)] = \mathbb{E}_\lambda[Y_{v,A}(t)] = \lambda P^t(v, A) \le \lambda |A| \sup_{x,y \in V} P^t(x, y) \le C_d \lambda |A| / \sqrt{t},$$

where we have used the fact that for all $t \ge 1$, $\sup_x P^t(x, x) \le C_d/\sqrt{t}$ (c.f. [9, Theorem 21.18]) and that $\sup_{x,y} P^{2t+1}(x, y) \le \sup_{x,y} P^{2t}(x, y) = \sup_x P^{2t}(x, x)$, since by reversibility (used in the second equality and in $\sum_z [P^t(a, z)]^2 = \sum_z P^t(a, z) P^t(z, a) = P^{2t}(a, a)$) and the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality (first inequality)

$$P^{2t}(x, y) = \sum_z P^t(x, z) P^t(z, y) = \sum_z P^t(x, z) P^t(y, z) \le \sqrt{P^{2t}(x, x) P^{2t}(y, y)} \le \sup_x P^{2t}(x, x).$$

□

### 2.3 Insertion tolerance, translation invariance, ergodicity.

We now show how the SN model on a graph $G$ with a countable vertex set $V$ can be viewed as a ***long-range bond percolation process*** on $G$. This will allow us to use existing machinery from percolation theory in our study of the SN model.

Let $S := \{\{v,u\} : v \neq u,\, v,u \in V\}$. The *standard form* of a probability space of a long-range bond percolation process on $G$ is $(\{0,1\}^S, \mathrm{P}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{cylinder}})$, where $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{cylinder}}$ is the the cylinder $\sigma$-algebra (the minimal $\sigma$-algebra w.r.t. which $\{x \in \{0,1\}^S : x(s) = 1\}$ is measurable for all $s \in S$). Each $x \in \{0,1\}^S$ can be viewed as a graph $\mathrm{graph}(x) = (V, E(x))$, where $s \in E(x)$ iff $x(s) = 1$, in which case we say $s$ is *open* in the configuration $x$. If $x(s) = 0$ we say that $s$ is *closed* in the configuration $x$. For $\mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{cylinder}}$ we write $\mathrm{graph}(\mathcal{B}) := \{\mathrm{graph}(b) : b \in \mathcal{B}\}$.

Let $(\Omega, \mathrm{P}, \mathcal{F})$ be a probability space in which there exist zero-one valued random variables $(Z_s)_{s\in S}$ ($S$ as above). This probability space gives rise to a (long-range bond) *percolation process* on $G$ as follows. For every $\omega \in \Omega$ we construct a graph $\mathrm{graph}(\omega) = (V, E(\omega))$ by setting $s \in E(\omega)$ iff $Z_s(\omega) = 1$. Note that $\omega \to \mathrm{graph}(\omega)$ need not be bijective.

There is a canonical correspondence between $(\Omega, \mathrm{P}, \mathcal{F})$ and a probability space having the standard form. For every $\omega \in \Omega$, we define $\psi(\omega) \in \{0,1\}^S$ by setting $\psi(\omega)(s) = Z_s(\omega)$. For every $\mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{F}$ set $\psi(\mathcal{B}) := \{\psi(b) : b \in \mathcal{B}\} \subset \{0,1\}^S$. Conversely, for every $x \in \{0,1\}^S$ we set $\psi^{-1}(x) := \{\omega \in \Omega : \psi(\omega) = x\}$ and for every $\mathcal{B} \subset \{0,1\}^S$ we set $\psi^{-1}(\mathcal{B}) := \bigcup_{x\in\mathcal{B}} \psi^{-1}(x)$. By abuse of notation, we identify the restriction of P to the $\sigma$-algebra generated by $(Z_s)_{s\in S}$ with the space $(\{0,1\}^S, \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{cylinder}}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{cylinder}})$, where for every $\mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{cylinder}}$, $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{cylinder}}(\mathcal{B}) := \mathrm{P}(\psi^{-1}(\mathcal{B}))$. That is, we identify $x \in \{0,1\}^S$ and $\mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{cylinder}}$ with $\psi^{-1}(x)$ and $\psi^{-1}(\mathcal{B})$, respectively, and by abuse of notation write $\mathrm{P}(\mathcal{B})$ for $\mathrm{P}(\psi^{-1}(\mathcal{B}))$. In particular, we say that P satisfies one of the properties defined below if $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{cylinder}}$ satisfies it.

For every $x \in \{0,1\}^S$ and $s \in S$, we define $x_s^+ \in \{0,1\}^S$ by setting

$$x_s^+(s') := \begin{cases} 1 & s' = s, \\ x(s') & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For every $s \in S$ and $\mathcal{B} \subset \{0,1\}^S$, we define

$$\mathcal{B}_s^+ := \{b_s^+ : b \in \mathcal{B}\}.$$

Note that $\mathrm{graph}(\mathcal{B}_s^+) = \{(V, E(b) \cup \{s\}) : b \in \mathcal{B}\}$ (where as before $\mathrm{graph}(b) = (V, E(b))$). We say that P is ***insertion tolerant*** (also known as having *positive finite energy*) if for all $\mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{cylinder}}$ such that $\mathrm{P}(\mathcal{B}) > 0$ also $\mathrm{P}(\mathcal{B}_e^+) > 0$, for all $e \in E$.

Every $\phi \in \mathrm{Aut}(G)$ acts on $\{0,1\}^S$ ($\phi : \{0,1\}^S \to \{0,1\}^S$) via $\phi(x)(s) = x(\phi(s))$. Clearly, $\mathrm{graph}(\phi(x))$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{graph}(x)$ and is obtained from $\mathrm{graph}(x)$ by a translation. We say that an event $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{cylinder}}$ is ***translation invariant*** if for all $\phi \in \mathrm{Aut}(G)$ we have that $\mathcal{A} = \phi(\mathcal{A})$, where $\phi(\mathcal{A}) := \{\phi(a) : a \in \mathcal{A}\}$. We denote the $\sigma$-algebra of all translation invariant events by $\mathcal{I}$. We say that P is ***translation invariant*** if for all $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{cylinder}}$ we have that $\mathrm{P}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathrm{P}(\phi(\mathcal{A}))$ for all $\phi \in \mathrm{Aut}(G)$. When the percolation process is defined via Bernoulli random variables $(Z_s)_{s\in S}$, this is equivalent to the requirement that for all $\phi \in \mathrm{Aut}(G)$, $(Z_s)_{s\in S} \stackrel{d}{=} (Z_{\phi(s)})_{s\in S}$, where $\stackrel{d}{=}$ denotes equality in distribution (of the joint distribution). We say that P is ***ergodic*** if $\mathrm{P}(\mathcal{A}) \in \{0,1\}$ for all $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{I}$.

The following simple lemma shall be helpful in what comes. Using the notation from Section 2.2, let $\mathbf{W}_v := ((\mathbf{w}_i^v(t))_{t\geq 0})_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{W}_v|}$ be the infinite walks that the walkers in $\mathcal{W}_v$ performed.

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let $G = (V, E)$ be an infinite connected graph. Let $\lambda > 0$, $\epsilon > 0$ and $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$. Then for every $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{cylinder}}$, there exist a finite set $B = B(\mathcal{A}, \epsilon, t) \subset V$ and $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon$ such that the event $\mathrm{AC}_t^\lambda(G) \in \mathrm{graph}(\mathcal{A}_\epsilon)$ is in the $\sigma$-algebra generated by $(\mathbf{W}_u : u \in B)$ and*

$$\mathrm{P}_\lambda[\mathrm{AC}_t^\lambda(G) \in \mathrm{graph}(\mathcal{A}_\epsilon \triangle \mathcal{A})] \leq \epsilon.$$

*Proof.* Fix some $v \in V$. Let $B_r := \{u \in V : \mathrm{dist}(u, v) \leq r\}$ be the ball of radius $r$ around $v$. Let $S(B_r) := \{\{u, u'\} : u \neq u', u, u' \in B_r\}$. Let $\mathcal{F}_r \subset \mathcal{F}_{\text{cylinder}}$ be the $\sigma$-algebra $\mathcal{F}_r := \{\{x \in \{0,1\}^S : \forall s \in S(B_r),\, x(s) = f(s)\} : f \in \{0,1\}^{S(B_r)}\}$. Since $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{cylinder}}$, elementary measure theoretical considerations imply that for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exist some $r > 0$ and $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon \in \mathcal{F}_r$ such that $\mathrm{P}_\lambda[\mathrm{AC}_t^\lambda(G) \in \mathrm{graph}(\mathcal{A}_\epsilon \triangle \mathcal{A})] \leq \epsilon$. Clearly, the fact that $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon \in \mathcal{F}_r$ implies that the event $\mathrm{AC}_t^\lambda(G) \in \mathrm{graph}(\mathcal{A}_\epsilon)$ is in the $\sigma$-algebra generated by $(\mathbf{W}_u : u \in B_r)$. □

**Proposition 2.5.** *Let $G = (V, E)$ be an infinite connected vertex-transitive graph. Then for all $\lambda > 0$ we have that the law of $\mathrm{AC}_t^\lambda(G)$ is translation invariant and ergodic for all $\lambda > 0$ and $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$.*

*Proof.* We first establish translation invariance. Let $\phi \in \mathrm{Aut}(G)$. We shall show that there exists a coupling of $\mathrm{AC}_t^\lambda(G)$ and $\phi(\mathrm{AC}_t^\lambda(G))$ (i.e. a probability space in which both are realized) such that $\mathrm{AC}_t^\lambda(G) = \phi(\mathrm{AC}_t^\lambda(G))$. This clearly implies the desired equality of the corresponding laws.

Note that if $(\mathbf{w}(s))_{s \geq 0}$ has law $\mathbb{P}_v$ then $(\phi(\mathbf{w}(s)))_{s \geq 0}$ has law $\mathbb{P}_{\phi(v)}$. Recall the construction of the SN model from § 2.2 via $(M_v, ((\mathbf{w}_n^v(s))_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_+})_{n \in \mathbb{N}})_{v \in V}$, where $(M_v)_{v \in V}$ are i.i.d. $\mathrm{Pois}(\lambda)$ and $((\mathbf{w}_n^v(s))_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_+})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are independent LSRW started from $v$ (i.e. having law $\mathbb{P}_v$). Denote this realization of $\mathrm{AC}_t^\lambda(G)$ by $H := (V, E(H))$. Now consider the realization obtained by replacing for all $v \in V$ the walks $((\mathbf{w}_n^v(s))_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_+})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ by $((\phi(\mathbf{w}_n^{\phi^{-1}(v)}(s)))_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_+})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and replacing $M_v$ by $M_{\phi^{-1}(v)}$ and denote it by $H' := (V, E(H'))$. Note that $\{u, v\} \in E(H')$ iff there is some $k \leq M_{\phi^{-1}(u)}$, $m \leq M_{\phi^{-1}(v)}$ and $s \leq t$ such that $\mathbf{w}_k^{\phi^{-1}(u)}(s) = \mathbf{w}_m^{\phi^{-1}(v)}(s)$. This occurs iff $\{\phi^{-1}(u), \phi^{-1}(v)\} \in E(H)$, or equivalently iff $\{u, v\}$ is an edge in $\phi(H)$. That is $H' = \phi(H)$.

We now prove ergodicity. Let $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{I}$. Fix some $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$. We seek to show that $\mathrm{P}_\lambda[\mathrm{AC}_t^\lambda \in \mathrm{graph}(\mathcal{A})] \in \{0, 1\}$. Let $\epsilon > 0$. By Lemma 2.4, there exist a finite set $B_\epsilon \subset V$ and an event $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon$ such that $\{\mathrm{AC}_t^\lambda(G) \in \mathrm{graph}(\mathcal{A}_\epsilon)\}$ is in the $\sigma$-algebra generated by $(\mathbf{W}_b(t))_{b \in B_\epsilon}$ and $\mathrm{P}_\lambda[\mathrm{AC}_t^\lambda(G) \in \mathrm{graph}(\mathcal{A}_\epsilon \triangle \mathcal{A})] \leq \epsilon$. Let $r_\epsilon := \max\{\mathrm{dist}(u, v) : u, v \in B_\epsilon\}$. Let $\phi_\epsilon \in \mathrm{Aut}(G)$ be such that for all $v \in V$, $\mathrm{dist}(v, \phi_\epsilon(v)) > 2r_\epsilon$.

The event $\{\mathrm{AC}_t^\lambda(G) \in \mathrm{graph}(\phi_\epsilon(\mathcal{A}_\epsilon))\}$ is in the $\sigma$-algebra generated by $(\mathbf{W}_{\phi_\epsilon(b)}(t))_{b \in B_\epsilon}$. By our choice of $\phi_\epsilon$, the sets $B_\epsilon$ and $\{\phi_\epsilon(b) : b \in B_\epsilon\}$ are disjoint. Hence the events $\{\mathrm{AC}_t^\lambda(G) \in \mathrm{graph}(\phi_\epsilon(\mathcal{A}_\epsilon))\}$ and $\{\mathrm{AC}_t^\lambda(G) \in \mathrm{graph}(\mathcal{A}_\epsilon)\}$ are independent, as they depend on disjoint sets of walkers. By translation invariance and the fact that $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{I}$ (and so $\phi_\epsilon(\mathcal{A}_\epsilon) \triangle \mathcal{A} = \phi_\epsilon(\mathcal{A}_\epsilon \triangle \mathcal{A})$)

$$\mathrm{P}_\lambda[\mathrm{AC}_t^\lambda(G) \in \mathrm{graph}(\phi_\epsilon(\mathcal{A}_\epsilon) \triangle \mathcal{A})] = \mathrm{P}_\lambda[\mathrm{AC}_t^\lambda(G) \in \mathrm{graph}(\mathcal{A}_\epsilon \triangle \mathcal{A})] \leq \epsilon.$$

Hence $\mathrm{P}_\lambda[\mathrm{AC}_t^\lambda(G) \in \mathrm{graph}((\mathcal{A}_\epsilon \cap \phi_\epsilon(\mathcal{A}_\epsilon)) \triangle \mathcal{A})] \leq 2\epsilon$ and thus

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{P}_\lambda[\mathrm{AC}_t^\lambda(G) \in \mathrm{graph}(\mathcal{A})] &= \lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \mathrm{P}_\lambda[\mathrm{AC}_t^\lambda(G) \in \mathrm{graph}(\mathcal{A}_\epsilon \cap \phi_\epsilon(\mathcal{A}_\epsilon))] \\ &= \lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \mathrm{P}_\lambda[\mathrm{AC}_t^\lambda(G) \in \mathrm{graph}(\mathcal{A}_\epsilon)]\mathrm{P}_\lambda[\mathrm{AC}_t^\lambda(G) \in \mathrm{graph}(\phi_\epsilon(\mathcal{A}_\epsilon))] \\ &= \lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \mathrm{P}_\lambda[\mathrm{AC}_t^\lambda(G) \in \mathrm{graph}(\mathcal{A}_\epsilon)]^2 = \mathrm{P}_\lambda[\mathrm{AC}_t^\lambda(G) \in \mathrm{graph}(\mathcal{A})]^2.\end{aligned}$$

Thus indeed $\mathrm{P}_\lambda[\mathrm{AC}_t^\lambda(G) \in \mathrm{graph}(\mathcal{A})] \in \{0, 1\}$, as desired. □

### 2.4 Couplings and stochastic domination

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph. As before, let $S := \{\{v, u\} : v \neq u,\, v, u \in V\}$. Equip $\{0, 1\}^S$ with the partial order $\leqslant$, where $x \leqslant y$ iff $x(s) \leq y(s)$ for all $s \in S$. We say that $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{cylinder}}$ is increasing if $x \in \mathcal{A}$ and $x \leqslant y$ imply that also $y \in \mathcal{A}$. For any two probability measures on $(\{0, 1\}^S, \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{cylinder}})$, $\mu$ and $\nu$, we say that $\mu$ stochastically dominates $\nu$ if $\mu(A) \geq \nu(A)$ for every increasing event $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{cylinder}}$.

Let $(X_s)_{s\in S}$ and $(Y_s)_{s\in S}$ be Bernoulli random variables defined on the same probability space $(\Omega, \mathrm{P}, \mathcal{F})$. Let the marginal distributions of $(X_s)_{s\in S}$ and $(Y_s)_{s\in S}$ under P be $\mu$ and $\nu$, respectively. Such a construction is called a *coupling* of $\mu$ and $\nu$. It is well-known and straightforward to show that if there exists such a coupling in which for all $s \in S$, $X_s \geq Y_s$ P-a.s., then $\mu$ stochastically dominates $\nu$. Thus by Proposition 2.2:

**Proposition 2.6.** *For every underlying graph $G$ for the SN model we have that for all $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$, the law of $\mathrm{AC}_t^{\lambda_2}$ stochastically dominates the law of $\mathrm{AC}_t^{\lambda_1}$ for all $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2$.*

### 2.5 Non-amenability and the spectral radius

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a connected infinite regular graph. Let $0 \leq p < 1$. Let $P_p$ be the transition kernel of LSRW on $G$ with holding probability $p$ ($P_p = pI + (1-p)P_0$, where $P_0$ corresponds to simple random walk on $G$). Let $x, y \in V$ be arbitrary vertices. The ***spectral radius*** of $P_p$ is defined as

$$\rho_p := \limsup_{n\to\infty} (P_p^n(x, y))^{1/n}. \tag{2.1}$$

We denote $\rho(G) := \rho_0$. The spectral radius satisfies the following general inequality,

$$P_p^n(x, y) \leq \rho_p^{2\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}, \text{ for all } x, y \in V \text{ and } n \geq 0. \tag{2.2}$$

Thus having $\rho_p < 1$ is equivalent to having uniform exponential decay of the transition probabilities w.r.t. $P_p$. It is not hard to show that $\rho_p = p + (1-p)\rho(G)$ and so $\rho(G) < 1$ iff $\rho_p < 1$ for all $p \in [0, 1)$.

## 3 Proof of Proposition 1.3

*Proof.* We work with (1.3) as the definition of $\lambda_{\mathrm{c}}$. We first note that if $\lambda_{\mathrm{c}} > 0$ and $0 < \lambda < \lambda_{\mathrm{c}}$, then there exists a sequence $(u_n, v_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset V \times V$ such that $\mathrm{P}_\lambda[\mathrm{FC}(u_n) = \mathrm{FC}(v_n)$ and $u_n, v_n \in \Xi] \leq 2^{-n}$, for all $n$. By (both parts of) the Borel-Cantelli Lemma, $\mathrm{P}_\lambda$-a.s. there exists some

$n$ such that $\mathrm{FC}(u_n) \neq \mathrm{FC}(v_n)$ and $u_n, v_n \in \Xi$. Thus $\mathrm{P}_\lambda[\mathbf{Con}] = 0$. Conversely, fix some $\lambda > \lambda_c \geq 0$. We shall show that $\mathrm{P}_\lambda[\mathbf{Con}] = 1$.

By definition of $\lambda_c$ (and the monotonicity of the model w.r.t. $\lambda$) there exists some $p > 0$ such that for all $\lambda' \geq \frac{\lambda+\lambda_c}{2}$, $\inf_{u,v} \mathrm{P}_{\lambda'}[\mathrm{FC}(u) = \mathrm{FC}(v) \mid u, v \in \Xi] \geq p$. Fix some $u, v \in V$. Let us condition on $u, v \in \Xi$. Let $B_r$ be the ball of radius $r$ around $u$. Let $D_t$ be the event that there exist some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and some $u_1 = u, u_2, \ldots, u_{k+1} = v$ all belonging to $B_t$ such that $u_i \overset{t}{\leftrightarrow} u_{i+1}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$. Since $D_t \nearrow u \overset{\infty}{\leftrightarrow} v$ as $t \to \infty$ (recall that a path of acquaintances has a finite length) there exists a finite time $t_1$ and some finite set $A_1 \subset V$ (both may depend on $u, v$), such that w.p. at least $p/2$, there exists a path of acquaintances between the walkers from $\mathcal{W}_u$ and $\mathcal{W}_v$ by time $t_1$, which only uses walkers from $\mathcal{W}_{A_1} := \cup_{w \in A_1} \mathcal{W}_w$. We think of this as the "first trial" to connect the walkers in $\mathcal{W}_u$ to those in $\mathcal{W}_v$. Using the regeneration Lemma we show that after each failed trial, there will be another trial whose success probability is at least $p/2$, regardless of the information exposed in all previous trials. All trials involve some finite set of walkers and a finite amount of time (both may depend on the information exposed in previous trials).

Denote by $Y_{a,1}(t)$ the number of walkers not from $\mathcal{W}_{A_1}$ which are at vertex $a$ at time $t$. By Lemma 2.3, there exists some $s_1$ so that $(Y_{a,1}(s_1))_{a \in V}$ stochastically dominate i.i.d. $\mathrm{Pois}(\lambda_2)$, where $\lambda_2 := \lambda_c + \frac{3(\lambda-\lambda_c)}{4}$. We may assume that $s_1 = t_1$ by increasing one of them if necessary. Pick some $w_u \in \mathcal{W}_u$ and $w_v \in \mathcal{W}_v$ and let $(\mathbf{w}_u(t))_{t=0}^\infty, (\mathbf{w}_v(t))_{t=0}^\infty$ be the LSRWs they perform (resp.). Let $\mathcal{W}_a(t)$ be the collection of walkers which are at vertex $a$ at time $t$.

Repeating the same reasoning as before (with $\lambda_2 > \frac{\lambda+\lambda_c}{2}$ in the role of $\lambda$) yields that there must exist some $t_2 > t_1$ and some finite set $A_2 \subset V$ (both may depend on $(\mathbf{w}_v(t_1), \mathbf{w}_u(t_1))$) such that given the walks performed by the walkers in $\mathcal{W}_{A_1}$ by time $t_1$ (and that the first trial failed): (i) the conditional probability that $w_u$ and $w_v$ have a path of acquaintances by time $t_2$ which uses only walkers from $\cup_{a \in A_2} \mathcal{W}_a(t_1) \setminus (\mathcal{W}_{A_1} \setminus \{w_v, w_u\})$ (and all the acquaintances along this path were made between time $t_1$ and $t_2$) is at least $p/2$ and (ii) $(Y_{a,2}(t_2))_{a \in V}$ stochastically dominate i.i.d. $\mathrm{Pois}(\lambda_3)$, where $\lambda_3 := \lambda_c + \frac{5(\lambda-\lambda_c)}{8}$ and $Y_{a,2}(t_2)$ is the number of walkers, not in $\mathcal{W}_{A_1} \cup (\cup_{b \in A_2} \mathcal{W}_b(t_1))$, which are at $a$ at time $t_2$. It is clear how to continue. □

## 4 The amenable case

We shall utilize the following theorem, taken from [5], in our analysis of the amenable case. We note that in [5] only the graphs $\mathbb{Z}^d$ ($d \in \mathbb{N}$) were considered, though their analysis can easily be extended to all amenable vertex-transitive graphs.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let $G = (V, E)$ be an infinite connected vertex-transitive graph. Let $(\Omega, \mathrm{P})$ be a translation invariant long range bond percolation process on $G$ possessing insertion tolerance. Then $\mathrm{P}[$there exists at most one infinite connected component$] = 1$.*

Note that for all $\mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{cylinder}}$ and $e = \{u, v\} \in E$, by planting additional walkers at $u$ and $v$ (this is done in the proof below) it is easy to see that for $\mathcal{A} := \mathrm{graph}(\mathcal{B})$ we have that

$$\mathrm{P}_\lambda[\mathrm{AC} \in \mathcal{A}] > 0 \Longrightarrow \mathrm{P}_\lambda[\mathrm{AC} \in \{(V, F) : e \in F, F \supseteq F' \text{ for some } (V, F') \in \mathcal{A}\}] > 0.$$

The problem is that planting additional walkers at $u$ and $v$ might add more than just the edge $\{u, v\}$ to AC (thus this idea cannot be used to establish insertion tolerance). In order to utilize Theorem 4.1, we construct an auxiliary model, stochastically dominated by the SN model, to which this idea applies. In order to ensure we can add to the obtained graph with positive probability an edge $e$ and *only* that edge, in the auxiliary model the planted walkers can only make acquaintances at time 1, and these acquaintances are censored with some positive probability using independent coin flips.

**Theorem 4.2.** *Let $G = (V, E)$ be an infinite connected vertex-transitive amenable graph. Then $\lambda_c = 0$.*

*Proof.* Let $\lambda > 0$. Consider a variation of the SN model on $G$ in which there are two disjoint types of walkers. At time 0, at each vertex $v \in V$ the number of walkers of type $i$ is $N_{v,i} \sim \mathrm{Pois}(\lambda/2)$ $(i = 1, 2)$, where $(N_{v,i})_{v\in V, 1\le i\le 2}$ are independent. All walkers perform independent LSRW simultaneously. Let $\mathcal{W}_{v,i} := \{w^{(i)}_{v,1}, \ldots, w^{(i)}_{v,N_{v,i}}\}$ be the set of walkers of type $i$ whose initial position is $v$. As in Section 2.2, we may assume that the underlying probability space, $(\Omega, \mathrm{P})$, contains independent infinite walks $((\mathbf{w}^{(i)}_{v,n}(t))_{t\ge 0})_{v\in V, n\ge 1, i=1,2}$, where $\mathbf{w}^{(i)}_{v,n}$ has law $\mathbb{P}_v$ and "decodes" the infinite walk performed by $w^{(i)}_{v,n}$, the $n$-th walker of type $i$ in $\mathcal{W}_{v,i}$. That is, for each vertex $v$ we have infinitely many independent walks of each type, but as in Section 2.2 only $N_{v,i}$ ($i = 1, 2$ resp.) of them matter.

Let $H = (V, E^1 \cup E^2)$ be a random graph defined by setting $\{u, v\} \in E^1$ iff there exists a walker in $\mathcal{W}_{u,1}$ who eventually met a walker from $\mathcal{W}_{v,1}$ and $E^2 \subset E$ is defined as follows. Let $(\mathrm{Coin}^{i,j}_{u,v})_{u\sim v,\, i,j\in\mathbb{N}}$ be i.i.d. Bernoulli(1/2) r.v.'s so that all of the random variables and random walks in the collections $(\mathrm{Coin}^{i,j}_{u,v})_{u\sim v,\, i,j\in\mathbb{N}}$, $(N_{v,i})_{v\in V, 1\le i\le 2}$ and $(\mathbf{w}^{(i)}_{v,n})_{v\in V, n\ge 1, i=1,2}$ are jointly independent. Let $\{u, v\} \in E$. We set $\{u, v\} \in E^2$ if there exist $1 \le k \le N_{v,2}$ and $1 \le m \le N_{v,2}$ such that $\mathbf{w}^{(2)}_{u,k}(1) = \mathbf{w}^{(2)}_{v,m}(1)$ and $\mathrm{Coin}^{k,m}_{u,v} = 1$ (that is, the walkers $(w^{(2)}_{u,k}, w^{(2)}_{v,m}) \in \mathcal{W}_{u,2} \times \mathcal{W}_{v,2}$ met at time 1 (this is always possible by laziness) and their coin has value 1).

The proof of translation invariance of the SN model, with minor adaptations can easily be extended to show that the law of $H$ is translation invariant. We now show that the law of $H$ is insertion tolerant. Let $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{cylinder}}$. Assume that $\mathrm{P}[H \in \mathrm{graph}(\mathcal{A})] > 0$. Let $u, v \in V$ be two neighboring vertices. Recall that $\mathrm{graph}(\mathcal{A}^+_{\{u,v\}})$ is the collection of all graphs $H' = (V, E')$ such that $\{u, v\} \in E'$ and there is some $\bar{H} = (V, \bar{E}) \in \mathrm{graph}(\mathcal{A})$ such that $E' \supset \bar{E}$ and $E' \setminus \bar{E} \subset \{\{u, v\}\}$. Our task is to show that $\mathrm{P}[H \in \mathrm{graph}(\mathcal{A}^+_{\{u,v\}})] > 0$.

Fix some $u, v \in V$ such that $\{u, v\} \in E$. Let $X^{\text{type 2, time 1}}_u$ be the number of walkers of type 2 whose position at time 1 is $u$. Let $\mathcal{B}_{u,v,\ell}$ be the collection of all $x \in \Omega$ for which $H(x) \in \mathrm{graph}(\mathcal{A})$ and $\max\{|\mathcal{W}_{u,2}(x)|, |\mathcal{W}_{v,2}(x)|, X^{\text{type 2, time 1}}_u(x)\} < \ell$. Then there is some $r = r_\lambda > 0$ such that $\mathrm{P}[\mathcal{B}_{u,v,r}] > \frac{\mathrm{P}[H\in\mathcal{A}]}{2} > 0$. Fix some $x \in \mathcal{B}_{u,v,r}$. Define $\mathcal{X}_{u,v}(x)$ to be the collection of all $y \in \Omega$ such that:

(i) (*Planting extra walkers of type 2 in $u$ and $v$*) $N_{a,1}(y) = N_{a,1}(x)$ for all $a \in V$ and

$$N_{a,2}(y) = \begin{cases} N_{a,2}(x) + 1 & a \in \{u, v\}, \\ N_{a,2}(x) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(ii) (*Copying the walks in $x$ and "forcing" the planted walkers to meet at time 1*)
$(\mathbf{w}^{(2)}_{u,N_{u,2}(x)+1}(1))(y) = u = (\mathbf{w}^{(2)}_{v,N_{v,2}(x)+1}(1))(y)$ and
$(\mathbf{w}^{(i)}_{w,n}(t))_{t\geq 0}(y) = (\mathbf{w}^{(i)}_{w,n}(t))_{t\geq 0}(x)$ for all $(w,n,i) \notin \{(u, N_{u,2}(x)+1, 2), (v, N_{v,2}(x)+1, 2)\}$.

(iii) (*Flipping the value of the coins corresponding to the planted walkers, if necessary*)

$$\mathrm{Coin}^{i,j}_{u',v'}(y) = \begin{cases} 1 & u' = u, v' = v, i = N_{u,2}(x)+1, j = N_{v,2}(x)+1, \\ 0 & (u',i) = (u, N_{u,2}(x)+1),\ j \leq N_{v',2}(x), \mathbf{w}^{(2)}_{v',j}(1) = \mathbf{w}^{(2)}_{u,i}(1) \\ 0 & (v',j) = (v, N_{v,2}(x)+1), i \leq N_{u',2}(x), \mathbf{w}^{(2)}_{u',i}(1) = \mathbf{w}^{(2)}_{v,j}(1) \\ \mathrm{Coin}^{i,j}_{u',v'}(x) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

By construction, for all $x \in \mathcal{B}_{u,v,r}$ and $y \in \mathcal{X}_{v,u}(x)$ the graph corresponding to $y$ is in $\mathrm{graph}(\mathcal{A}^+_{\{u,v\}})$. Using Fubini's Theorem it is not hard to verify that for every pair of neighboring vertices $u, v$ the event $H \in \bigcup_{x\in\mathcal{B}_{u,v,r}} \mathrm{graph}(\mathcal{X}_{u,v}(x))$ is measurable and that there exists some $c = c_{d,\lambda} > 0$, such that

$$\mathrm{P}[H \in \mathrm{graph}(\mathcal{A}^+_{\{u,v\}})] \geq \mathrm{P}[H \in \bigcup_{x\in\mathcal{B}_{u,v,r}} \mathrm{graph}(\mathcal{X}_{u,v}(x))]$$

$$\geq 2c\mathrm{P}[H \in \mathrm{graph}(\mathcal{B}_{u,v,r})] \geq c\mathrm{P}[H \in \mathrm{graph}(\mathcal{A})] > 0.$$

This concludes the proof of insertion tolerance.

We now argue that for all $v \in V$, given that $|\mathcal{W}_{v,1}| > 0$, the connected component of $v$ in $H$ is a.s. infinite. This can be proved using similar reasoning as in the proof of Proposition 1.3. In particular, $H$ has at least one infinite connected component a.s.. By Theorem 4.1, $H$ has a unique infinite connected component, $C$. Since every $v$ with $|\mathcal{W}_{v,1}| > 0$ belongs to some infinite connected component of $H$ a.s., we get that $\{v : |\mathcal{W}_{v,1}| > 0\} \subset C$ a.s..

We are now ready to conclude the proof of the theorem. We may use the probability space on which $H$ is defined to generate $\mathrm{AC}^\lambda(G)$. This is done by ignoring the type to which each walker belongs (i.e. by allowing walkers of different types to meet each other, not necessarily at time 1 and disregarding the coins). Once this is done, the SN model is defined using the walkers in the usual manner. One can readily see that in our coupling of $H$ and $\mathrm{AC}^\lambda(G)$, $\mathrm{P}_\lambda$-a.s. there exists a connected component (of $\mathrm{AC}^\lambda(G)$) $C_1$ such that $\{v : |\mathcal{W}_{v,1}| > 0\} \subset C_1$ a.s.. By symmetry, there is also a connected component (of $\mathrm{AC}^\lambda(G)$) $C_2$ such that $\{v : |\mathcal{W}_{v,2}| > 0\} \subset C_2$ $\mathrm{P}_\lambda$-a.s.. As a.s. there is some $v$ such that both $\mathcal{W}_{v,1}$ and $\mathcal{W}_{v,2}$ are non-empty, a.s. $C_1 = C_2$. The set of all vertices $u$ such that $|\mathcal{W}_{u,1}| > 0$ or $|\mathcal{W}_{u,2}| > 0$ is exactly $\Xi$. Thus a.s. all $v \in \Xi$ is in $C_1$. This implies that $\mathrm{P}_\lambda[\mathbf{Con}] = 1$, as desired. □

## 5 A lower bound on $\lambda_c$ in the non-amenable case

**Theorem 5.1.** *Let $G = (V, E)$ be an infinite connected non-amenable regular graph. Denote the spectral radius of LSRW on $G$ (with an arbitrary holding probability $p$) by $\rho$. Then the SN model on $G$ with holding probability $p$ satisfies*

$$\mathrm{P}_\lambda[\mathbf{Con}] = 0, \text{ for all } \lambda < \frac{1}{2}\left(\rho^{-1} - 1\right).$$

Throughout the section we fix the holding probability of the walks to be some constant $0 \leq p < 1$. Let $\mu_\lambda$ (resp. $\nu_\lambda$) be the distribution of $1+2X_\lambda$ (resp. $1+X_\lambda$), where $X_\lambda \sim \mathrm{Pois}(\lambda)$. A ***lazy branching random walk*** on $G$ with offspring distribution $\mu_\lambda$ started at a vertex $o$, denoted by $\mathrm{LBRW}(\mu_\lambda, o)$, is defined as follows. At time 0 there are a random number of particles distributed according to $\nu_\lambda$ which are all positioned at vertex $o$. Call the set of these particles generation number 0. The process is then defined inductively. At stage $t$ each particle $w$ belonging to the $t$-th generation performs one step of LSRW on $G$ from its position at time $t$, where steps performed by different particles are independent. Then it gives birth to a random number of particles (referred to as its offsprings), $Y_w \sim \mu_\lambda$, at its current position, independently of all other particles. The set of all the offspring of the particles from the $t$-th generation is defined to be the $(t+1)$-th generation.

The following interpretation of $\mathrm{LBRW}(\mu_\lambda, o)$ is useful for our purposes. First, by including the previous generations as part of the current generation, we may think of the offspring distribution as being the same as that of $2X_\lambda$, where $X_\lambda \sim \mathrm{Pois}(\lambda)$. Equivalently, in this interpretation, a particle does not "die" after giving birth to some offspring at a certain step, and may give birth to additional offspring in future stages (alternatively, we may view the particle as an "offspring of itself"). Furthermore, we may think of each particle as giving birth to $\mathrm{Pois}(\lambda)$ "regular particles" which then clone themselves. By reversibility, we may think of the regular particles as performing independent LSRWs, while the clones perform a LSRW moving backwards in time.

We now describe a process which, based on the previous two observations, is essentially equivalent to $\mathrm{LBRW}(\mu_\lambda, o)$. In particular, the expected total number of visits to each vertex (including multiplicities) is the same for the two processes. While the definition of this process is somewhat cumbersome, it will be transparent that this process stochastically dominates the exploration process used below in order to "expose" $\mathrm{FC}(o)$.

In the 0-th generation, $\mathcal{V}_{0,0}$, we start with $1+\mathrm{Pois}(\lambda)$ walkers at $o$, $v_{0,0,1}, \ldots, v_{0,0,|\mathcal{V}_{0,0}|}$. Let each $v_{0,0,j}$ perform a $\mathbb{Z}$-labeled (bi-infinite) random walk on $G$, conditioned to be at $o$ at time 0, $(\mathbf{v}_{0,0,j}(t))_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$. Such a walk can be sampled by taking two independent $\mathbb{Z}_+$-labeled walks started at $v$, $(\mathbf{fv}_{0,0,j}(t))_{t\geq 0}$ and $(\mathbf{bv}_{0,0,j}(t))_{t\geq 0}$ (which can be thought of as 2 independent walks performed by 2 separate particles) and concatenating one to the reversal of the other as follows $\mathbf{v}_{0,0,j}(t) := \mathbf{fv}_{0,0,j}(t)$ and $\mathbf{v}_{0,0,j}(-t) := \mathbf{bv}_{0,0,j}(t)$ for $t \geq 0$.

In the first stage we expose $\mathbf{v}_{0,0,j}(\pm 1)$ for all $j$ (in the above interpretation, we expose one step of the walk of the forward particle $\mathbf{fv}_{0,0,j}(1)$ and one of the backward particle $\mathbf{bv}_{0,0,j}(1)$) and plant at $\mathbf{v}_{0,0,j}(\pm 1)$ (independently for different $j$'s and for $\pm 1$), $\mathrm{Pois}(\lambda)$ walkers performing (independent) $\mathbb{Z}$-labeled random walks on $G$, conditioned to be at $\mathbf{v}_{0,0,j}(\pm 1)$ at time $\pm 1$ (resp.). Denote the set of walkers planted at stage 1 at time $\pm 1$ by $\mathcal{V}_{1,\pm 1} = \{v_{1,\pm 1,1}, \ldots, v_{1,\pm 1,|\mathcal{V}_{1,\pm 1}|}\}$ (resp.). The construction continues inductively as follows:

By the end of stage $r$, for all $0 \leq i \leq r$ and $-i \leq j \leq i$ such that $i-j$ is even, we have already defined the set of walkers planted at stage $i$ and time $j$, $\mathcal{V}_{i,j} = \{v_{i,j,1}, \ldots, v_{i,j,|\mathcal{V}_{i,j}|}\}$, and exposed (for all $1 \leq k \leq |\mathcal{V}_{i,j}|$) $(\mathbf{v}_{i,j,k}(t))_{t:|t-j|\leq r-i}$ (where $v_{i,j,k}$ is the $k$-th walker in $\mathcal{V}_{i,j}$ and $(\mathbf{v}_{i,j,k}(t))_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is the walk she performs). In the $(r+1)$-th stage we expose for all $i, j, k$ as before $\mathbf{v}_{i,j,k}(j \pm (r+1-i))$ and plant at $\mathbf{v}_{i,j,k}(j \pm (r+1-i))$ (independently for different $(i,j,k)$'s and for $j \pm (r+1-i)$), $\mathrm{Pois}(\lambda)$ walkers performing (independent) $\mathbb{Z}$-labeled random walks on

$G$, conditioned to be at $\mathbf{v}_{i,j,k}(j \pm (r+1-i))$ at time $j \pm (r+1-i)$ (resp.). Finally, we denote the set of walkers planted at stage $r+1$ at time $\ell$ by $\mathcal{V}_{r+1,\ell} = \{v_{r+1,\ell,1}, \ldots, v_{r+1,\ell,|\mathcal{V}_{r+1,\ell}|}\}$.

Below we expose $\mathrm{FC}(o)$ in "slow motion" using an exploration process. At each stage $t$ of the exploration process, new walkers are "recruited" to the friend cluster by meeting at some time $s \leq t$ walkers already belonging to the exploration process. The walkers recruited at stage $t$ can be thought of as the $t$-th generation of the exploration process. Let $w$ be some walker in the $t$-th generation of the exploration process who was recruited at stage $t$ due to an acquaintance which occurred at time $s$ (the set of such walkers shall be denoted below by $\mathcal{W}_{t,s}$). Instead of exposing in the $(t+1)$-th stage the entire trajectory of $w$, we expose its position at times $s+1$ and $s-1$. At stage $t+2$ we expose its position at times $s+2$ and $s-2$ (if $s \geq 2$), and so on (at stage $t+i$ we expose its position at time $s+i$ and if $s \geq i$ also at time $s-i$). Let $(\mathbf{w}(n))_{n\geq 0}$ be the infinite walk performed by $w$. We can think of $w$ as two separate particles, one a forward particle performing the forward walk $(\mathbf{w}(t+n))_{n\geq 0}$ and the other a clone performing the reversed walk $(\mathbf{w}(t-n))_{n:0\leq n\leq t}$. At each stage, for every previously exposed walker $w$ we expose one step of its forward walk and one step of its reversed walk (or in the above terminology, one step of the walk performed by its clone), if it was not fully exposed already. The particle (or clone) recruits new walks if she meets them at the space-time co-ordinate of her walk which was exposed at the current stage, and if those walkers avoided all the space-time co-ordinates previously exposed by the exploration process.

Using Poisson thinning, we can dominate this exploration process by the equivalent formulation of $\mathrm{LBRW}(\mu_\lambda, o)$, involving the $\mathbb{Z}$-valued walks and the sets $\mathcal{V}_{t,s}$. Indeed there are two differences between the two. The first is that in the latter the walks of the particles moving backwards in time continue all the way to time $-\infty$ instead of stopping at time 0. The second difference is that in the exploration process of $\mathrm{FC}(o)$ each particle can only recruit "new" walkers (and their clones), which means that these walkers have to avoid certain space-time co-ordinates previously exposed by the exploration process. Thus, her offspring (= new walkers recruited by her at each stage and their clones) distribution is stochastically dominated by the $2\mathrm{Pois}(\lambda)$ distribution.

Note that if $\mathrm{P}_\lambda[\mathbf{Con}] > 0$, then for some $o$, $\mathrm{P}_\lambda[\mathbf{Con} \cap \{o \in \Xi\}] > 0$ and so the expected number of times in which vertex $o$ is visited by walkers from $\mathrm{FC}(o)$ including multiplicities (we consider also visits made by a walker $w \in \mathrm{FC}(o)$ at time $t$ in which $w \notin \mathrm{FC}_t(o)$) is infinite (by stationarity). The assertion of Theorem 5.1 follows by combining the following proposition and lemma.

**Proposition 5.2.** *Let $X_v$ be the number of times vertex $v$ was visited by a walker from* $\mathrm{FC}(o)$ *(including multiplicities) when the density of the walkers is taken to be $\lambda$. Let $Y_v$ be the number of times that vertex $v$ was visited by a particle in* $\mathrm{LBRW}(\mu_\lambda, o)$ *(where if a particle of the* $\mathrm{LBRW}(\mu_\lambda, o)$ *is born at vertex $v$ this also contributes to $Y_v$). Let $\nu_1$ and $\nu_2$ be the joint laws of $(X_v)_{v\in V}$ and $(Y_v)_{v\in V}$, respectively. Then $\nu_2$ stochastically dominates $\nu_1$.*

**Lemma 5.3.** *For $v \in V$ and $n \geq 0$, let $Q_n(v)$ be the the number of particles belonging to the $n$-th generation of* $\mathrm{LBRW}(\mu_\lambda, o)$ *which were born at vertex $v$. Then for all $v$ and $n$,*

$$\mathbb{E}[Q_n(v)] = (1+\lambda)(1+2\lambda)^n P^n(o,v) \leq (1+2\lambda)^2[(1+2\lambda)\rho]^{n-1}. \tag{5.1}$$

The proof of the equality in (5.1) is obtained by a simple induction on $n$, performed simultaneously over all vertices. The inequality follows from (2.2).

We denote the walk performed by a walker $w$ by $(\mathbf{w}(t))_{t\geq 0}$. Denote the set of walkers whose location at time $t$ is $v$ by $\mathcal{W}_v(t)$. For $B \subset V$ and $t \geq 0$ let $\mathcal{W}_B(t) := \cup_{b\in B}\mathcal{W}_b(t)$ be the set of walkers occupying $B$ at time $t$. We denote the lexicographic order by $\prec$.

*Proof of Proposition 5.2:* At stage zero, we start the exploration process of FC($o$) by setting $\mathcal{W}_{0,0} := \mathcal{W}_o$ and $\mathcal{A}_{0,0} = \{v\}$. Label the walkers in $\mathcal{W}_{0,0}$ as $w_{0,0,1}, \ldots, w_{0,0,|\mathcal{W}_{0,0}|}$.

If $\mathcal{W}_o$ is empty the exploration process is completed. Otherwise, at stage one we set $\mathcal{A}_{1,1} := \{\mathbf{w}(1) : w \in \mathcal{W}_{0,0}\}$ and $\mathcal{W}_{1,1} := \{w \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{A}_{1,1}}(1) : w \notin \mathcal{W}_{0,0}\}$ to be the collection of walkers not belonging to $\mathcal{W}_{0,0}$, which have the same position at time 1 as some walker in $\mathcal{W}_{0,0}$. We say that $w \in \mathcal{W}_{1,1}$ is an offspring of $w_{0,0,j}$ if $\mathbf{w}(1) = \mathbf{w}_{0,0,j}(1)$ and $j$ is the minimal integer such that this holds. Finally, we label the elements of $\mathcal{W}_{1,1}$ as $w_{1,1,1}, \ldots, w_{1,1,|\mathcal{W}_{1,1}|}$.

The first "interesting" stage of the process is stage 2, thus we describe it before proceeding to the description of a general stage. Let $\mathcal{A}_{2,0} := \{\mathbf{w}(0) : w \in \mathcal{W}_{1,1}\}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{2,2} := \{\mathbf{w}(2) : w \in \mathcal{W}_{0,0} \cup \mathcal{W}_{1,1}\}$. We set $\mathcal{W}_{2,0} := \{w \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{A}_{2,0}}(0) : w \notin \mathcal{W}_{1,1}\}$ and $\mathcal{W}_{2,2} := \{w \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{A}_{2,2}}(2) : w \notin \cup_{(i,j)\prec(2,2)}\mathcal{W}_{i,j}\}$. The parent of $w \in \mathcal{W}_{(2,0)}$ (resp. $\mathcal{W}_{2,2}$) is $w_{1,1,k} \in \mathcal{W}_{1,1}$ (resp. $w_{i,j,k} \in \mathcal{W}_{0,0} \cup \mathcal{W}_{1,1}$) such that $\mathbf{w}(0) = \mathbf{w}_{1,1,k}(0)$ (resp. $\mathbf{w}(2) = \mathbf{w}_{i,j,k}(2)$) and $(1,1,k)$ (resp. $(i,j,k)$) is minimal w.r.t. $\prec$. Finally, for $(i,j) \in \{(2,0),(2,2)\}$ we label the walkers in $\mathcal{W}_{i,j}$ as $w_{i,j,1}, \ldots, w_{i,j,|\mathcal{W}_{i,j}|}$.

The sets $\mathcal{A}_{r,s}$ and $\mathcal{W}_{r,s} = \{w_{r,s,1}, \ldots, w_{r,s,|\mathcal{W}_{r,s}|}\}$ ($0 \leq s \leq r$ is of the same parity as $r$) are defined inductively so that the following holds:

(1) $\mathcal{A}_{r,s} := \{\mathbf{w}(s) : w \in \cup_{(i,j)\in F_{r,s}\cup B_{r,s}}\mathcal{W}_{i,j}\}$, where $F_{r,s} := \{(i,j) : (i,j) \prec (r,s) \text{ and } r-i = s-j > 0\}$ and $B_{r,s} := \{(i,j) : j-s = r-i > 0\}$.

(2) $\mathcal{W}_{r,s} := \{w \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{A}_{r,s}}(s) : w \notin \cup_{(i,j)\prec(r,s)}\mathcal{W}_{i,j}\}$. Note that this is the set of walkers which joins the exploration process at stage $r$ and time $s$ (that is, they joined the exploration process because they share the same position at time $s$ as some previously exposed walker).

It is easy to see that $\cup_{(r,s):\, r\geq s,\, r-s \text{ is even}}\mathcal{W}_{r,s} = \text{FC}(o)$.

We now describe the assignment of offspring to walkers. In the $r$-th stage we expose the sets $\mathcal{A}_{r,s}$ ($0 \leq s \leq r$, of the same parity as $r$) sequentially according to the order $\prec$. We expose each $\mathcal{A}_{r,s}$ by exposing sequentially the positions of the walkers in $\cup_{(i,j)\in F_{r,s}\cup B_{r,s}}\mathcal{W}_{i,j}$ one walker at a time, according to the order $\prec$ (over the indices of the walkers $(i,j,k)$ such that $(i,j) \in F_{r,s} \cup B_{r,s}$, $1 \leq k \leq |\mathcal{W}_{i,j}|$). We say that $w \in \mathcal{W}_{r,s}$ is an offspring of $w_{i,j,k}$ ($(i,j) \in F_{r,s} \cup B_{r,s}$, $1 \leq k \leq |\mathcal{W}_{i,j}|$) if $\mathbf{w}(s) = \mathbf{w}_{i,j,k}(s)$ but for all $(i',j',k') \prec (i,j,k)$ such that $(i',j') \in F_{r,s} \cup B_{r,s}$, $1 \leq k' \leq |\mathcal{W}_{i',j'}|$ we have that $\mathbf{w}(s) \neq \mathbf{w}_{i',j',k'}(s)$. Moreover, as $w \notin \cup_{(i',j')\prec(r,s)}\mathcal{W}_{i',j'}$ (by the definition of $\mathcal{W}_{r,s}$), we also have that $\mathbf{w}(\ell) \notin \mathcal{A}_{n,\ell}$ for all $0 \leq \ell \leq n \leq r$ ($n-\ell$ is even) such that $(n,\ell) \prec (r,s)$. If $s > j$ (resp. $j > s$) we say that $w$ is a *forward* (resp. *backward*) offspring of $w_{i,j,k}$. Let $\mathcal{B}_{i,j,k}(r-i)$ and $\mathcal{F}_{i,j,k}(r-i)$ be the backward and forward (resp.) offspring of $w_{i,j,k}$ at stage $r$. Denote by $B_{i,j,k}(r-i)$ and $F_{i,j,k}(r-i)$ the collection of space-time co-ordinates which (as described above) a walker in $\mathcal{B}_{i,j,k}(r-i)$ and $\mathcal{F}_{i,j,k}(r-i)$ (resp.) has to avoid (namely, these are the space-time co-ordinates exposed prior to the exposure of $\mathcal{B}_{i,j,k}(r-i)$ and $\mathcal{F}_{i,j,k}(r-i)$, resp.).

We think of a walker $w_{i,j,k}$ as performing a forward walk, $\mathbf{fw}_{i,j,k}(\ell) := \mathbf{w}(j+\ell)$ and a backward walk (of length $j$) $\mathbf{bw}_{i,j,k}(\ell) = \mathbf{w}(j-\ell)$. At each stage $r \geq i$ we expose one additional step of $\mathbf{fw}_{i,j,k}$ (namely, $\mathbf{fw}_{i,j,k}(r-i)$) and if $j \geq r-i$ also one additional step of $\mathbf{bw}_{i,j,k}$ (namely, $\mathbf{bw}_{i,j,k}(r-i)$). Note that the forward (resp. backward) offspring of $w_{i,j,k}$ at stage $r$ are precisely the collection of all walkers $w$ whose location at time $j+r-i$ (resp. $j-r+i$) is $\mathbf{w}_{i,j,k}(j+r-i)$ (resp. $\mathbf{w}_{i,j,k}(j-r+i)$) so that $(\mathbf{w}(\ell),\ell) \notin F_{i,j,k}(r-i)$ (resp. $\notin B_{i,j,k}(r-i)$) for all $0 \leq \ell \leq r$.

Recall that $\Gamma_r$ is the collection of all walks of length $r$ in $G$ and that for $\gamma \in \Gamma_r$, we denote the number of walkers which performed the walk $\gamma$ by $X_\gamma \sim \mathrm{Pois}(\lambda p(\gamma))$, where $p(\gamma) := \prod_{i=0}^{r-1} P(\gamma_i,\gamma_{i+1})$ . Let $\Gamma_{i,j,k,r,\mathrm{f}}$ (resp. $\Gamma_{i,j,k,r,\mathrm{b}}$) be the collection of all $\gamma = (\gamma_0,\ldots,\gamma_r) \in \Gamma_r$ such that $(\gamma_\ell,\ell) \notin F_{i,j,k}(r-i)$ for all $\ell$ and $\gamma_{j+r-i} = \mathbf{w}_{i,j,k}(j+r-i)$ (resp. $(\gamma_\ell,\ell) \notin B_{i,j,k}(r-i)$ for all $\ell$ and $\gamma_{j-r+i} = \mathbf{w}_{i,j,k}(j-r+i)$). By Poisson thinning, given $F_{i,j,k}(r-i)$ and $\mathbf{w}_{i,j,k}(j+r-i)$ (resp. $B_{i,j,k}(r-i)$ and $\mathbf{w}_{i,j,k}(j-r+i)$), $(X_\gamma)_{\gamma\in\Gamma_{i,j,k,r,\mathrm{f}}}$ (resp. $(X_\gamma)_{\gamma\in\Gamma_{i,j,k,r,\mathrm{b}}}$) are independent Poisson r.v.'s with mean $\lambda p(\gamma)$, resp..

Now, consider the case that after exposing $\mathbf{w}_{i,j,k}(j+r-i)$ (resp. $\mathbf{w}_{i,j,k}(j-r+i)$ ), for each $\gamma \in \{\gamma' \in \Gamma_r : \gamma'_{j+r-i} = \mathbf{w}_{i,j,k}(j+r-i)\} \setminus \Gamma_{i,j,k,r,\mathrm{f}}$ (resp. $\gamma \in \{\gamma' \in \Gamma_r : \gamma'_{j-r+i} = \mathbf{w}_{i,j,k}(j-r+i)\} \setminus \Gamma_{i,j,k,r,\mathrm{b}}$ ) we "plant" $\lambda p(\gamma)$ new "dummy particles" (independently for different such $\gamma$'s) which perform the path $\gamma$, and then continue their walk after time $r$ randomly. The dummy particles do not discover new walkers in the following stages of the exploration process (i.e. they do not have any offspring and the trajectory of their walk plays no role in the following stages). If we count the dummy particles as part of the offspring of $w_{i,j,k}$ corresponding to its forward step at stage $r$, then we have that $(X_\gamma^{i,j,k,r,\mathrm{f}})_{\gamma\in\Gamma_r:\gamma_{j-r+i}=\mathbf{w}_{i,j,k}(j-r+i)}$ are independent Poisson r.v.'s and $\mathbb{E}_\lambda[X_\gamma^{i,j,k,r,\mathrm{f}}] = \lambda p(\gamma)$ for all $\gamma \in \{\gamma' \in \Gamma_r : \gamma'_{j-r+i} = \mathbf{w}_{i,j,k}(j-r+i)\}$, where $X_\gamma^{i,j,k,r,\mathrm{f}}$ is the number of offspring of $w_{i,j,k}$ corresponding to its forward step at stage $r$ who perform the walk $\gamma$. By Poisson thinning, this is the same as having $\mathrm{Pois}(\lambda)$ offspring, each performing an independent $\mathbb{Z}_+$-labeled LSRW on $G$, conditioned to be at $\mathbf{w}_{i,j,k}(j+r-i)$ at time $j+r-i$. A similar statement holds for the number of offspring of $w_{i,j,k}$ corresponding to its backwards step at stage $r$.

Recall the construction of the sets $\mathcal{V}_{r,s} = \{v_{r,s,1},\ldots,v_{r,s,|\mathcal{V}_{r,s}|}\}$ from the equivalent representation of $\mathrm{LBRW}(\mu_\lambda,o)$. It is not hard to prove that the sets $\mathcal{W}_{r,s}$ and $\mathcal{V}_{r,s}$ can be coupled (for all $0 \leq s \leq r$ so that $r-s$ is even) so that $\mathcal{W}_{r,s} \subset \mathcal{V}_{r,s}$. More precisely, this can be done so that for all $k \leq |\mathcal{W}_{r,s}|$, $\mathbf{v}_{r,s,k}(t) = \mathbf{w}_{r,s,k}(t)$ for all $t \geq 0$). We leave the details as an exercise. □

## 6 An upper bound on $\lambda_\mathrm{c}$ in the non-amenable setup.

**Theorem 6.1.** *Let $G=(V,E)$ be a $d$-regular connected infinite non-amenable graph. Denote the spectral radius of LSRW with holding probability $1/(d+1)$ (resp. $1/2$) by $\rho$ (resp. $\rho_{1/2}$). If the holding probability of the walks is $1/(d+1)$ (resp. $1/2$) then $\lambda_\mathrm{c} \leq (d+1+\frac{4}{1-\rho})\log 8$ (resp. $\lambda_\mathrm{c} \leq 20\log d/(1-\rho_{1/2})$).*

*Proof.* First consider the case that the holding probability is $(d+1)^{-1}$. Fix some $u,v \in \Xi$ and $\lambda > (d+1+\frac{4}{1-\rho})\log 8$. We shall construct two random paths (more precisely, two sequences of vertices) $\gamma,\gamma'$ such that the walkers which are at $\gamma_t$ (resp. $\gamma'_t$) at time $\ell+t$ (for

some $\ell$ to be determined below) are in FC($v$) (resp. FC($u$)). Denote the natural filtration of $(\gamma_t, \gamma'_t)_{t\geq 0}$ by $\mathcal{F}_t$. We will show that there exists some $c > 0$ such that, on the event $d(\gamma_t, \gamma'_t) > 0$, $\mathbb{E}_\lambda[d(\gamma_{t+1}, \gamma'_{t+1}) - d(\gamma_t, \gamma'_t) \mid \mathcal{F}_t] \leq -c$, for all $t \geq 1$ (where $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the graph distance, i.e. the paths have a bias towards each other). This clearly implies that (given that $u, v \in \Xi$) FC($u$) = FC($v$) $\mathrm{P}_\lambda$-a.s..

Fix some $\alpha > \log 8$. At time 0 expose some $w_v \in \mathcal{W}_v =: \mathcal{A}_0, w_u \in \mathcal{W}_u =: \mathcal{B}_0$ and their locations at time $\ell$ and set $\gamma_0$ and $\gamma'_0$ to be these locations, resp., where $\ell$ is sufficiently large so that the distribution of the number of walkers, not belonging to $\mathcal{A}_0 \cup \mathcal{B}_0$ at the different vertices of $G$ at all times $t \geq \ell$, stochastically dominates that of i.i.d. Pois($\lambda'$), where $\lambda' := \alpha(d + 1 + \frac{4}{1-\rho})$. In other words,

$$\inf_{t\geq \ell, a\in V} \kappa_t(a) \geq \lambda', \quad \text{where} \quad \kappa_t(a) := \lambda(1 - P^t(u, a) - P^t(v, a)).$$

For an oriented edge (possibly a loop) $e = (e^-, e^+)$ let $\mathcal{W}_e(t)$ be the collection of all walkers whose positions at times $t$ and $t + 1$ are $e^-$ and $e^+$, resp.). Clearly, it suffices to describe the construction of $\gamma, \gamma'$ only until the first $k$ for which $\gamma_k = \gamma'_k$. We define $\gamma, \gamma'$ inductively as follows. Assume that $(\gamma_i, \gamma'_i)_{i=0}^{k-1}$ and some collection of oriented edges $e_1, f_1, \ldots, e_{k-1}, f_{k-1}$, have already been defined and that for all $1 \leq i < k$ in the $i$-th step of the construction we first define $e_i$, then (as described in (3) below) expose a certain set of walkers, $\mathcal{A}_i \subset \mathcal{W}_{e_i}(\ell + i - 1)$ and define $\gamma_i$ (as described below in (2)), after which we define $f_i$, expose a set of walkers $\mathcal{B}_i \subset \mathcal{W}_{f_i}(\ell + i - 1)$ and finally define $\gamma'_i$, such that the following hold (the construction is described only in (2) and (3), while (4)-(6) are including as part of the induction hypothesis only to facilitate the induction step):

(1) $\gamma_i \neq \gamma'_i$ for all $i < k$ (otherwise, the construction is concluded before stage $k$).

(2) For all $i < k$, $e_i = (e_i^-, e_i^+)$ is some oriented edge in $G$ of the form $e_i = (\gamma_{i-1}, v_i)$ satisfying that $d(v_i, \gamma'_{i-1}) = d(\gamma_{i-1}, \gamma'_{i-1}) - 1$. We then define

$$\mathcal{A}_i \subset \mathcal{R}_i := \mathcal{W}_{e_i}(\ell + i - 1) \setminus (\bigcup_{j=0}^{i-1} \mathcal{A}_j \cup \mathcal{B}_j)$$

as described in (3) below. If $|\mathcal{A}_i| \geq 1$ we set $\gamma_i = v_i = e_i^+$. Otherwise, we define $\gamma_i$ to be some vertex occupied at time $\ell + i$ by some walker in $\cup_{j=0}^{i-1}\mathcal{A}_j$ of minimal distance from $\gamma'_{i-1}$. Similarly, after defining $\gamma_i$, we set $f_i = (f_i^-, f_i^+))$ to be of the form $f_i = (\gamma'_{i-1}, u_i)$ satisfying that $d(\gamma_i, u_i) = d(\gamma_i, \gamma'_{i-1}) - 1$ if $\gamma_i \neq \gamma'_{i-1}$; otherwise, we set $u_i := \gamma_i$. As before, as described in (3) below, we then define

$$\mathcal{B}_i \subset \mathcal{R}'_i := \mathcal{W}_{f_i}(\ell + i - 1) \setminus (\bigcup_{j=0}^{i-1} \mathcal{A}_j \cup \mathcal{B}_j).$$

If $|\mathcal{B}_i| \geq 1$ we set $\gamma'_i = u_i = f_i^+$. Otherwise, we define $\gamma'_i$ to be some vertex occupied at time $\ell + i$ by some walker in $\cup_{j=0}^{i-1}\mathcal{B}_j$ of minimal distance from $\gamma_i$.

(3) The sets $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{B}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{A}_{k-1}, \mathcal{B}_{k-1}$ are all disjoint and their sizes are i.i.d. Pois($\alpha$). Denote

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_i(y) &:= \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \mathbb{E}_\lambda[|\mathcal{A}_j|] P^{i-j-1}(e_j^+, y) + \mathbb{E}_\lambda[|\mathcal{B}_j|] P^{i-j-1}(f_j^+, y) \\ &= \alpha \sum_{j=0}^{i-2} P^j(e_{i-j-1}^+, y) + P^j(f_{i-j-1}^+, y) \le 4\alpha \sum_{j\ge 0} \rho^j = 4\alpha/(1-\rho).\end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

Let $\mathcal{R}_i$ and $\mathcal{R}'_i$ be as in (2). Then, given $e_1, f_1, \ldots, e_{k-1}, f_{k-1}$, we have that $|\mathcal{R}_1|, |\mathcal{R}'_1|, \ldots, |\mathcal{R}_{k-1}|, |\mathcal{R}'_{k-1}|$ are independent Poisson r.v.'s, where for all $i < k$

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{R}_i|] = P(e_i^-, e_i^+)[\kappa_{i+\ell-1}(e_i^-) - \beta_i(e_i^-)] \ge \frac{1}{d+1}(\lambda' - 4\alpha/(1-\rho)) \ge \alpha, \\ &\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{R}'_i|] := P(f_i^-, f_i^+)[\kappa_{i+\ell-1}(f_i^-) - \beta_i(f_i^-)] \ge \alpha.\end{aligned} \tag{6.2}$$

For all $i < k$, $\mathcal{A}_i$ (resp. $\mathcal{B}_i$) is a random subset of $\mathcal{R}_i$ (resp. $\mathcal{R}'_i$) obtained from it by including in $\mathcal{A}_i$ (resp. $\mathcal{B}_i$) every element of $\mathcal{R}_i$ (resp. $\mathcal{R}'_i$) independently w.p. $p_i := \alpha/\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{R}_i|]$ (resp. $p'_i := \alpha/\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{R}'_i|]$). Note that by (6.2) $p_i, p'_i \le 1$.

(4) Consequently, for all $i < k$, if $\mathcal{W}_{j,i}(y)$ (resp. $\mathcal{W}'_{j,i}(y)$) is the set of walkers from $\mathcal{A}_j$ (resp. $\mathcal{B}_j$) which are at vertex $y$ at time $\ell + i$, then for each fixed $i < k$, given $e_1, f_1, \ldots, e_{i-1}, f_{i-1}$, the r.v.'s in the collections $(|\mathcal{W}_{j,i}(y)|)_{j<i, y\in V}$ and $(|\mathcal{W}'_{j,i}(y)|)_{j<i,y\in V}$ form together a family of jointly independent random variables, where for all $j < i$ and $y \in V$, $|\mathcal{W}_{j,i}(y)| \sim \text{Pois}(\alpha P^{i-j}(e_j^+, y))$ and $|\mathcal{W}'_{j,i}(y)| \sim \text{Pois}(\alpha P^{i-j}(f_j^+, y))$.

(5) For a walk $\mathbf{w} := (\mathbf{w}_0, \ldots, \mathbf{w}_{\ell+i})$ with $\mathbf{w}_0 \notin \{u, v\}$, let $I_{\mathbf{w}} := \{1 \le j < i : (\mathbf{w}_{\ell+j-1}, \mathbf{w}_{\ell+j}) = e_j\}$ and $J_{\mathbf{w}} := \{1 \le j < i : (\mathbf{w}_{\ell+j-1}, \mathbf{w}_{\ell+j}) = f_j\}$. Then for all $i < k$ and all such walk $\mathbf{w} := (\mathbf{w}_0, \ldots, \mathbf{w}_{\ell+i})$ with $\mathbf{w}_0 \notin \{u, v\}$, given $e_1, f_1, \ldots, e_{i-1}, f_{i-1}$, the number of walkers not belonging to $(\bigcup_{j=0}^{i-1} \mathcal{A}_j \cup \mathcal{B}_j)$ which performed the walk $\mathbf{w}$, $Q_{\mathbf{w}}$, has a Poisson distribution (with mean $\lambda p(\mathbf{w}) \prod_{j\in I_{\mathbf{w}}}(1-p_j) \prod_{j'\in J_{\mathbf{w}}}(1-p'_{j'})$, where $p_j$ and $p'_j$ are as in (3); this expression for the mean shall not be used). Moreover, for each fixed $i < k$, given $e_1, f_1, \ldots, e_{i-1}, f_{i-1}$, the $Q_{\mathbf{w}}$'s ($\mathbf{w}$ as above, of length $\ell + i$) and $(|\mathcal{W}_{j,i}(y)|)_{j<i,y\in V}$ and $(|\mathcal{W}'_{j,i}(y)|)_{j<i,y\in V}$ form together a family of jointly independent random variables.

(6) Consequently, for all $i \le k$ the number of walkers not belonging to $(\bigcup_{j=0}^{i-1} \mathcal{A}_j \cup \mathcal{B}_j)$ which are at vertex $y$ at time $\ell + i - 1$, $U_y^i$, has a Poisson distribution (by (5)) with mean (by (4)) $\kappa_{i+\ell-1}(y) - \beta_i(y)$. Finally, for each fixed $i \le k$ we have that $(U_y^i)_{y\in V}$ are mutually independent.

In order to define $e_k, \mathcal{A}_k, \gamma_k, f_k, \mathcal{B}_k, \gamma'_k$ (in this order) we apply steps (2) and (3) with $k$ in the role of $i$. It is not hard to see that by the induction hypotheses (3)-(6) together with Poisson thinning and (6.2) (with $i = k$), this extends the construction by one step so that (2)-(6) remain valid for $k + 1$ in the role of $k$. We leave the details as an exercise.

Note that $d(\gamma_k, \gamma'_{k-1}) - d(\gamma_{k-1}, \gamma'_{k-1}) \le 1$ and that also $d(\gamma_k, \gamma'_k) - d(\gamma_k, \gamma'_{k-1}) \le 1$. By steps (2) and (4), the first increment equals $-1$ w.p. at least $\mathbb{P}(\text{Pois}(\alpha) > 0) = 1 - e^{-\alpha} > 7/8$ and the same holds for the second increment, unless $\gamma_k = \gamma'_{k-1}$, in which case the second

increment equals 0 w.p. at least $1 - e^{-\alpha} > 7/8$. Thus $\gamma$ and $\gamma'$ are indeed biased towards each other as desired.

We now consider the case of holding probability 1/2. We explain the necessary adaptations leaving some of the details as an exercise. Set $\lambda = \frac{20 \log d}{1-\rho_{1/2}}$. As before let $\gamma_0$ and $\gamma'_0$ be the positions of $w_v$ and $w_u$ at time $\ell$, resp., where $\ell$ is so that the distribution of the number of walkers, other than $w_u$ and $w_v$, at the different vertices of $G$ at time $\ell$ stochastically dominates that of i.i.d. Pois($\lambda'$) for some $\lambda' > \frac{20 \log d}{1-\rho_{1/2}} - 1$. For $a \in V$ we denote the set of walkers who are at $a$ at time $t$ by $\mathcal{W}_a(t)$. Assume that $(\gamma_i, \gamma'_i)_{i=0}^{k-1}$ has been defined and that in the $i$-th step of the construction we exposed sets of walkers $\mathcal{A}_i \subset \mathcal{W}_{e_i}(\ell + i - 1)$, $\mathcal{C}_i \subset \mathcal{W}_{\gamma_{i-1}}(\ell + i - 1) \cap \mathcal{W}_{\gamma_{i-1}}(\ell + i)$, $\mathcal{B}_i \subset \mathcal{W}_{f_i}(\ell + i - 1)$ and $\mathcal{D}_i \subset \mathcal{W}_{\gamma'_{i-1}}(\ell+i-1) \cap \mathcal{W}_{\gamma'_{i-1}}(\ell+i)$, (for some collection of oriented edges $e_1, f_1, \ldots, e_{k-1}, f_{k-1}$) so that $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{D}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{A}_{k-1}, \mathcal{B}_{k-1}, \mathcal{C}_{k-1}, \mathcal{D}_{k-1}$ are all disjoint, $|\mathcal{A}_1|, |\mathcal{B}_1|, \ldots, |\mathcal{A}_{k-1}|, |\mathcal{B}_{k-1}|$ are i.i.d. Pois($2d^{-1} \log d$) and $|\mathcal{C}_1|, |\mathcal{D}_1|, \ldots, |\mathcal{C}_{k-1}|, |\mathcal{D}_{k-1}|$ are i.i.d. Pois($4 \log d$). We set $e_k = (\gamma_{k-1}, v_k)$ to be some oriented edge in $G$ so that $d(v_k, \gamma'_{k-1}) = d(\gamma_{k-1}, \gamma'_{k-1}) - 1$ and expose a subset of $\mathcal{W}_{e_k}(\ell+k)$, $\mathcal{A}_k$, and a subset of $\mathcal{W}_{\gamma_{k-1}}(\ell+k-1) \cap \mathcal{W}_{\gamma_{k-1}}(\ell+k)$, $\mathcal{C}_k$, disjoint of the previously exposed sets of walkers, so that $|\mathcal{A}_k| \sim$ Pois($2d^{-1} \log d$) and $|\mathcal{C}_k| \sim$ Pois($4 \log d$) (a similar calculation as in the case of holding probability $1/(d+1)$ shows that there exists such $(\mathcal{A}_k, \mathcal{C}_k)$). If $|\mathcal{A}_k| > 0$ we set $\gamma_k = v_k$. If $|\mathcal{A}_k| = 0$ but $|\mathcal{C}_k| > 0$ we set $\gamma_k = \gamma_{k-1}$. If $|\mathcal{A}_k| = 0 = |\mathcal{C}_k|$, we define $\gamma_k$ to be some vertex occupied at time $\ell + k$ by some walker in $\cup_{i=0}^{k-1}(\mathcal{A}_i \cup \mathcal{C}_i)$ of minimal distance from $\gamma'_{k-1}$. We define $\mathcal{B}_k, \mathcal{D}_k$ and $\gamma'_k$ in an analogous manner (with $\gamma_k$ here taking the role of $\gamma'_{k-1}$ in the construction of $\mathcal{A}_k, \mathcal{C}_k$ and $\gamma_k$). Finally, note that each of the increments $d(\gamma_k, \gamma'_{k-1}) - d(\gamma_{k-1}, \gamma'_{k-1})$ and $d(\gamma_k, \gamma'_k) - d(\gamma_k, \gamma'_{k-1})$ is in $\{0, \pm 1\}$ and has mean at most $-(1 - e^{-2d^{-1} \log d}) + e^{-2d^{-1} \log d} e^{-4 \log d} < -d^{-1} \log d + d^{-4} < 0$. □

## 7 The $d$-regular tree - Proof of Theorem 2.

*Proof.* The lower bound follows from Theorem 5.1 and the fact that the spectral radius of the LSRW with holding probability $1/(d+1)$ on $\mathbb{T}_d$ is $\frac{1}{d+1} + \frac{d}{d+1}\frac{2\sqrt{d-1}}{d}$ (c.f. [10, Theorem 6.10]). We now prove the upper bound. By Theorem 6.1 we may assume that $d \geq 4$. Fix some $u, v \in V$. We shall show that if $\lambda \geq C\sqrt{d}$ for some constant $C$ to be determined later, then $\mathrm{P}_\lambda[\mathrm{FC}(u) = \mathrm{FC}(v) \mid u, v \in \Xi] > c_1$ for some constant $c_1 = c_1(d) > 0$ independent of $(u, v)$.

Throughout the proof we condition on the event that $u, v \in \Xi$. We now set $u$ to be the root of $\mathbb{T}_d$. This induces a partial order $\leq$ where $a \leq b$ iff the path from $b$ to $u$ goes through $a$. The children of $a \in V$ are $\{b : d(a, b) = 1, a \leq b\}$ (where $d(a, b)$ is the graph distance between $a$ and $b$). Denote $\ell := \lfloor (d-1)/2 \rfloor$. For each $a \in V$ we distinguish between its $\ell$ leftmost children, $L_a$, and its $d - \ell - 1$ rightmost children $R_a$ (apart from $a = u$, for which $R_u$ is taken to be the $d - \ell$ rightmost children of $u$). Let $\mathcal{R}$ be the collection of all vertices such that the path between them and $u$ is contained in $\{u\} \cup (\cup_{a \in V} R_a)$. By symmetry, we may assume that $v \in \mathcal{R}$. For each $a \in \mathcal{R}$ we denote by $\mathcal{T}_{a,L}$ the tree rooted at $a$ with vertex set $V_a := \{a\} \cup (\cup_{b' \in L_a} \{b : b' \leq b\})$ ($\mathcal{T}_{a,L}$ is the induced graph on this set). For each $a \in \mathcal{R}$ and $t \geq 1$ let $\mathcal{W}_{a,L}(t)$ be the set of walkers whose initial position is in $V_a \setminus \{a\}$ that reached $a$ for the first time at time $t$. Set $\mathcal{W}_{a,L}(0) := \mathcal{W}_a$. For $a \in \mathcal{R}$ and $b \sim a$ let $\mathcal{W}_{(a,b),L}(t)$ be the

set of walkers in $\mathcal{W}_{a,L}(t)$ whose location at time $t+1$ is $b$. As $\mathcal{T}_{a,L}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{a',L}$ are disjoint for all $a \neq a' \in \mathcal{R}$ we have that $(\mathcal{W}_{(a,b),L}(t))_{a\in\mathcal{R},b\sim a,t\in\mathbb{Z}_+}$ are disjoint. Hence by Poisson thinning

(1) $(|\mathcal{W}_{(a,b),L}(t)|)_{a\in\mathcal{R},b\sim a,t\in\mathbb{Z}_+}$ are independent and for each fixed $t$, $(|\mathcal{W}_{(a,b),L}(t)|)_{a\in\mathcal{R},b\sim a}$ are i.i.d. Pois$(\alpha_t)$, where (by reversibility)

$$\alpha_t(d+1)/\lambda = \sum_{b\in V_a} \mathbb{P}_b(T_a = t) = \mathbb{P}_a(S_1,\ldots,S_t \in V_a \setminus \{a\})$$

(where $(S_k)_{k\geq 0}$ is a LSRW, $T_a := \inf\{s : S_s = a\}$ and $\mathbb{P}_b$ denotes the law of a LSRW started from $b$).

Thus if $C$ is taken to be sufficiently large then

$$\alpha_t \geq \lambda \mathbb{P}_a(\{S_k : k \geq 1\} \subset V_a \setminus \{a\})/(d+1) > |\log\left(1 - 2/\sqrt{d-\ell-1}\right)|. \tag{7.1}$$

Denote by $\mathcal{T}_u = (U_u, E_u)$ and $\mathcal{T}_v = (U_v, E_v)$ the induced graphs on $U_u := \{a \in \mathcal{R} : v \not\leq a\}$ and $U_v := \{a \in \mathcal{R} : v \leq a\}$, resp.. For each $s \geq 0$, $a \in \mathcal{R}$ and $a' \sim a$ we denote by $J_{(a,a')}(s)$ the indicator of $|\mathcal{W}_{(a,a'),L}(s)| > 0$. Note that by (7.1)

$$p := \inf_{t>0}(1 - e^{-\alpha_t}) \geq 2/\sqrt{d-\ell-1}. \tag{7.2}$$

By (1) we have that

(2) The joint distribution of $(J_{(a,a')}(s))_{a\in\mathcal{R},a'\sim a,s\geq 0}$ stochastically dominates that of independent Bernoulli$(p)$ random variables.

We say that $u$ (resp. $v$) is *good* at time $2t$ if there exists some path $(\gamma_0 = u, \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_t)$ in $\mathcal{T}_u$ (resp. $(\gamma_0 = v, \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_t)$ in $\mathcal{T}_v$) such that $J_{(\gamma_i,\gamma_{i+1})}(i)J_{(\gamma_{i+1},\gamma_i)}(2t-i-1) = 1$ for all $0 \leq i \leq t-1$. We denote the indicator of $u$ (resp. $v$) being good at time $2t$ by $Z_u(2t)$ (resp. $Z_v(2t)$). Note that if $u$ (resp. $v$) is good at time $2t$ then there is some walker $w \in \mathrm{FC}_{2t}(u)$ (resp. $\mathrm{FC}_{2t}(v)$) which reached $u$ (resp. $v$) for the first time at time $2t$. Thus on the event that both $u$ and $v$ are good (simultaneously) for infinitely many even times, we get that a.s. $\mathrm{FC}(u) = \mathrm{FC}(v)$. Hence in order to conclude the proof it suffices to show that $u$ and $v$ are good (simultaneously) for infinitely many even times with probability at least $q > 0$, for some $q$ independent of $u, v$. We do so by comparison with super-critical Bernoulli bond percolation (on $\mathcal{T}_v$ and $\mathcal{T}_u$) which we now define.

Bernoulli bond percolation on a graph $H = (U, F)$ with density $q$ is a random graph $H_q = (U, F_q)$ such that $F_q \subset F$ is defined by including in it every edge $f \in F$ independently w.p. $q$. Let $p_c(H) := \inf\{q : H_q \text{ has an infinite connected component with positive probability}\}$ be the critical density for Bernoulli bond percolation on $H$. Then $p_c(\mathcal{T}_u) = 1/(d-\ell-1) = p_c(\mathcal{T}_v)$. Moreover, for all $q > p_c(\mathcal{T}_u)$ we have that a.s. $p_c((\mathcal{T}_u)_q) = p_c(\mathcal{T}_u)/q = p_c((\mathcal{T}_v)_q)$ (where $(\mathcal{T}_u)_q$ is the graph obtained from Bernoulli bond percolation with density $q$ on $\mathcal{T}_u$). In fact, for every $q > \sqrt{p_c(\mathcal{T}_u)}$ we have that

(3) The connected component of $u$ in $(\mathcal{T}_u)_q$, $C_{(\mathcal{T}_u)_q}(u)$, is infinite with positive probability.

(4) Let $\bar{\mathcal{T}} := ((\mathcal{T}_u)_q)_q$ be the graph obtained by Bernoulli bond percolation with density $q$ on $(\mathcal{T}_u)_q$. Given that $|C_{(\mathcal{T}_u)_q}(u)| = \infty$, the connected component of $u$ in $\bar{\mathcal{T}}$, $C_{\bar{\mathcal{T}}}(u)$, is infinite with positive probability.

(5) There exist $\beta, \delta > 0$ such that w.p. at least $\beta$ (over the choice of $(\mathcal{T}_u)_q$), $(\mathcal{T}_u)_q$ is such that $|C_{\bar{\mathcal{T}}}(u)| = \infty$ w.p. at least $\delta$ (conditioned on $(\mathcal{T}_u)_q$).

The same applies for $\mathcal{T}_v$ (with $v$ in the role of $u$ above). Note that by (7.2)

$$p > \sqrt{p_c(\mathcal{T}_u)}. \tag{7.3}$$

Let $b \in U_u$ (resp. $\in U_v$) and $b' \in R_b$. Denote $d(b,u) = r$ (resp. $d(b,v) = r$). We say that the edge $\{b, b'\}$ is *forward good* if $J_{(b,b')}(r) = 1$ and that it is *backwards good for time* $2t$ (for $t > r$) if $J_{(b',b)}(2t - r - 1) = 1$. This gives raise to the following random subgraphs of $\mathcal{T}_u = (U_u, E_u)$ and $\mathcal{T}_v = (U_v, E_v)$:

Let $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_u$ (resp. $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_v$) be a graph with vertex set $U_u$ (resp. $U_v$) and edge set $\tilde{E}_u := \{e \in E_u : e \text{ is forward good}\}$ (resp. $\tilde{E}_v := \{e \in E_v : e \text{ is forward good}\}$). Let $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{u,t} := (U_u, \tilde{E}_{u,t})$ be the random subgraph of $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_u$, defined by setting $\tilde{E}_{u,t}$ to be the collection of all $e \in E_{u,t}$ which are backwards good for time $2t$, where $E_{u,t}$ is the set of edges in $\mathcal{T}_u$ having both end-points within distance $t$ from $u$. Define $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{v,t} = (U_v, \tilde{E}_{u,t})$ in an analogous manner. Note that:

(6) $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_u$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_v$ are independent and (by (2)) $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_u$ (resp. $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_v$) stochastically dominates $(\mathcal{T}_u)_p$ (resp. $(\mathcal{T}_v)_p$).

(7) The collection of random forests $(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{w,t})_{w \in \{u,v\}, t \geq 1}$ are conditionally mutually independent, given $(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_u, \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_v)$ (this follows from (2)).

(8) Given $\tilde{E}_u \cap E_{u,t}$, the joint law of $(1_{e \in \tilde{E}_{u,t}})_{e \in \tilde{E}_u \cap E_{u,t}}$ stochastically dominates that of i.i.d. Bernoulli $p$ random variables, where $p$ as in (7.2) (this follows from (2)).

We say that $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_u$ (resp. $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_v$) is $\delta$-*excellent* if the connected components of $u$ (resp. $v$) is infinite and the probability that the connected component of $u$ (resp. $v$) in a Bernoulli bond percolation on $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_u$ (resp. $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_v$) with parameter $p$ is infinite is at least $\delta$. Note that by (6), the event that $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_u$ is $\delta$-excellent is independent of the event that $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_v$ is $\delta$-excellent. By (3)-(6) and (7.3) there exist some $\beta, \delta > 0$ (independent of $(u,v)$) so that $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_u$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_v$ are both $\delta$-*excellent* with probability at least $\beta$.

By (7)-(8), conditioned on $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_u$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_v$ both being $\delta$-excellent, the conditional joint distribution of $(Z_w(2t))_{w \in \{u,v\}, t > 0}$ stochastically dominates that of i.i.d. Bernoulli($\delta$) r.v.'s, and so indeed a.s. $Z_u(2t) = 1 = Z_v(2t)$ for infinitely many $t$'s, as desired. Indeed, by (7) it suffices to show that for each $w \in \{u,v\}$ and $t > 0$, $\mathrm{P}_\lambda[Z_w(2t) = 1 \mid \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_w \text{ is } \delta\text{-excellent}] > \delta$. By (8), for each fixed $t$, (given $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_u$) the (conditional) probability that $u$ is connected in $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{u,t}$ to some vertex of distance $t$ from it (i.e. that $Z_u(2t) = 1$) is at least the probability that the connected component of $u$ in $(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_u)_p$ is infinite, which is at least $\delta$, given that $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_u$ is $\delta$-excellent (an analogous statement holds for $v$). $\square$

## 8 Proof of Theorem 3

Before turning to the proof of Theorem 3 let us explain our strategy. Consider the following naive exploration process. Expose the first $t$ steps of some walker $w \in \mathcal{W}_v$ for some $v \in V$. Let $\mathcal{G}_1$ be the set of walkers that $w$ met by time $t$. Pick $t = t(\lambda, \rho)$ so that the expectation of $|\mathcal{G}_1|$ is at least some large constant $L$ (uniformly in $v$). Then sequentially expose the first $t$ steps of the walks performed by the walkers in $\mathcal{G}_1$ and let $\mathcal{G}_2$ be the collection of walkers not in $\mathcal{G}_1 \cup \{w\}$ which met some walker from $\mathcal{G}_1$ by time $t$. Inductively, let $\mathcal{G}_{k+1}$ be the collection of walkers not in $(\cup_{i=1}^{k} \mathcal{G}_i) \cup \{w\}$ which met some walker from $\mathcal{G}_k$ by time $t$.

The problem with this naive approach is that it is not clear that for large $k$, "typically": for $w' \in \mathcal{G}_k$ (or even for at least some fixed small fraction of $w' \in \mathcal{G}_k$) we have that the expectation of the contribution of $w'$ to $|\mathcal{G}_{k+1}|$ is large, because the contribution is restricted to walkers not in $(\cup_{i=1}^{k} \mathcal{G}_i) \cup \{w\}$ (plus we need to avoid double-counting contributions of different walkers in $\mathcal{G}_k$). However, as follows from our analysis below, if $\rho$ is sufficiently small (some precise version of) the statement of the previous sentence indeed holds.

Below we consider "$s$-walks" in order to obtain walks with sufficiently small spectral radius. Instead of the aforementioned naive aforementioned exploration process we work with a variant of an exploration process due to Benjamini, Nachmias and Peres [4] which allows us to perform effectively the bookkeeping of which "active but still unchecked" walkers (i.e. walkers already recruited to the exploration process, such that the $s$-walk performed by them is yet unexposed) are likely to recruit "many" new walkers to the exploration process.

*Proof.* Recall that $t_{C,\lambda} := \lceil \frac{C}{\lambda(1-\rho)} \rceil$, where $\rho$ is the spectral radius of LSRW on $G = (V, E)$. Fix some $v \in V$. By a standard use of Kolmogorov's 0-1 law, it suffices to show that $\mathrm{P}_\lambda[|\mathrm{FC}_{t_{C,\lambda}}(v)| = \infty] > 0$, provided that $C$ is sufficiently large. In particular, we may condition on $v \in \Xi$. Denote

$$s := \lceil 8K/(1-\rho) \rceil \quad \text{and} \quad M := \lceil 8K/\lambda \rceil, \quad \text{where } K \geq 3$$

shall be determined later. Consider the random walk obtained by replacing the transition kernel $P$ by $Q := P^s$ (i.e. every step of this walk is $s$ steps of the original LSRW). We refer to such walks as *$s$-walks* and denote it by $(S_t^{(s)})_{t \geq 0}$ and the corresponding probability measure (for initial state $u$) by $\mathrm{P}_u^{(s)}$ (similarly, when the initial distribution of the walk is $\mu$ we write $\mathrm{P}_\mu^{(s)}$).

Our strategy is to expose a subset of $\mathrm{FC}_{sM}(v)$ via a variant of an exploration process due to Benjamini, Nachmias and Peres [4]. Denote the set of walkers which are at vertex $u$ at time $t$ by $\mathcal{W}_u(t)$. Our exploration process produces increasing sets of space-time coordinates $\{\mathcal{A}_\ell\}_{\ell \geq 0}$, which are subsets of $V \times \{st : 0 \leq t \leq M\}$ so that for all $\ell$ and all $(u, st) \in \mathcal{A}_\ell$ we have that $\mathcal{W}_u(st) \subset \mathrm{FC}_{sM}(v)$. Start with $\mathcal{A}_0 := \{(v, 0)\}$. We proceed by exposing the first $sM$ steps of the walk performed by some walker in $\mathcal{W}_v$, $(\mathbf{w}_v(i))_{0 \leq i \leq sM}$ and set $\mathcal{A}_1 := \{(\mathbf{w}_v(ts), ts) : 0 \leq t \leq M, \mathbf{w}_v(ts) \notin \cup_{t' < t} \{(\mathbf{w}_v(t's)\}\}$, $\mathcal{C}_1 = \{(v, 0)\}$ and $\mathcal{U}_1 := \mathcal{A}_1 \setminus \mathcal{C}_1$. We will construct inductively sets $\mathcal{U}_\ell, \mathcal{C}_\ell$, $\mathcal{A}_\ell := \mathcal{U}_\ell \cup \mathcal{C}_\ell$ and

$$A_\ell := \{u : (u, st) \in \mathcal{A}_\ell \text{ for some } t\} \tag{8.1}$$

such that $\mathcal{A}_1 \subset \mathcal{A}_2 \subset \cdots$. To avoid double-counting (which may arise since $\mathcal{W}_u(st)$ and $\mathcal{W}_{u'}(st')$ need not be disjoint), we consider certain subsets of the $\mathcal{W}_u(st)$'s. Set

$$\mathcal{W}_u^\ell(st) := \mathcal{W}_u(st) \setminus \bigcup_{a \in A_\ell, t' \in \mathbb{Z}_+ : (a,t') \neq (u,s)} \mathcal{W}_a(st'). \tag{8.2}$$

From the construction below it will be clear that for all $\ell$

$$|\mathcal{A}_\ell| = |A_\ell| \quad \text{and} \quad |\mathcal{C}_\ell| = \ell.$$

At each stage $\ell$ some of $(u, st) \in \mathcal{A}_\ell$ will be *checked*, $\mathcal{C}_\ell$, and some *unchecked*, $\mathcal{U}_\ell$. As long as $\mathcal{U}_\ell$ is non-empty we can proceed with the $(\ell+1)$-th stage, in which we pick some $(u, st) \in \mathcal{U}_\ell$ (the manner in which we choose $(u, st)$ shall be described later) and first expose $|\mathcal{W}_u^\ell(st)|$ and set $\mathcal{C}_{\ell+1} := \mathcal{C}_\ell \cup \{(u, st)\}$. If $|\mathcal{W}_u^\ell(st)| = 0$ we set $\mathcal{U}_{\ell+1} := \mathcal{U}_\ell \setminus \{(u, st)\}$. Otherwise, we pick one walker $w$ from $\mathcal{W}_u^\ell(st)$ and expose its walk by time $sM$, $(\mathbf{w}(i))_{0 \le i \le sM}$ and set

$$\mathcal{U}_{\ell+1} := \mathcal{U}_\ell \cup \{(\mathbf{w}(is), is) : 0 \le i \le M, i \neq t, \mathbf{w}(is) \notin \cup_{j<i}\{\mathbf{w}(js)\}\} \setminus \{(u, st)\}.$$

We conclude the step by setting $\mathcal{A}_{\ell+1} := \mathcal{C}_{\ell+1} \cup \mathcal{U}_{\ell+1}$. To motivate what comes, assume for the moment that we can pick $(u, st) \in \mathcal{U}_\ell$ such that

$$\mathrm{P}^{(s)}[\forall t' \neq t, \quad S_{t'}^{(s)} \notin A_\ell \mid S_t^{(s)} = u] \ge 1 - 2e^{-4K}, \tag{8.3}$$

From the analysis below, it follows that for such $(u, st)$

$$|\mathcal{W}_u^\ell(st)| > 0 \text{ w.p. at least } 1 - e^{-(1-2e^{-4K})\lambda} \text{ and}$$

$$\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{U}_{\ell+1}| - |\mathcal{U}_\ell| \mid \mathcal{A}_\ell, |\mathcal{W}_u^\ell(st)|] \ge M/4 \text{ on the event } |\mathcal{W}_u^\ell(st)| > 0$$

(it equals $-1$ on the complement). Thus (provided that $K$ is sufficiently large), in such stage

$$\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{U}_{\ell+1}| - |\mathcal{U}_\ell|] \ge 4K.$$

If we could always pick such $(u, st)$, then it is intuitively clear that with positive probability $|\mathcal{A}_\ell| \ge 2\ell$ for all $\ell$ and thus the construction will have infinitely many stages, implying the desired result. As we now explain, at least a $(1 - e^{-4K})$-fraction of $(u, st) \in \mathcal{A}_\ell$ satisfy (8.3), and thus as long as $|\mathcal{A}_\ell| \ge 2\ell$, we will indeed be able to choose $(u, st) \in \mathcal{U}_\ell$ satisfying (8.3).

Following [4], given some $A \subset V$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ we say that $a \in V$ is $(A, \alpha)$-*good* if $\mathrm{P}_a^{(s)}[T_A^+ < \infty] \le \alpha$, where $T_A^+ := \inf\{t > 0 : S_t^{(s)} \in A\}$. Denote the uniform distribution on $A$ by $\pi_A$. As the spectral radius of $Q = P^s$ is $\rho^s \le e^{-8K}$, it follows from Lemma 2.1 in [4] that for every finite $A \subset V$

$$\mathrm{P}_{\pi_A}^{(s)}[T_A^+ < \infty] \le e^{-8K}. \tag{8.4}$$

It follows from (8.4) that for every finite $A \subset V$,

$$G_A := \{a \in A : a \text{ is } (A, e^{-4K})\text{-good}\}$$

satisfies

$$|G_A|/|A| \ge 1 - e^{-4K}. \tag{8.5}$$

Fix some $a \in G_A$ and $k \leq M$. Let

$$\mathcal{W}_a(A, ks) := \mathcal{W}_a(ks) \setminus \cup_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_+, a' \in A:(\ell,a') \neq (k,a)} \mathcal{W}_{a'}(\ell s)$$

be the collection of walkers which are at vertex $a$ at time $ks$, which avoid $A$ throughout their $s$-walks, apart from at time $ks$ (time $k$ for the $s$-walk). Note that when we take $A = A_\ell$ and $a \in A_\ell$, we have that $\mathcal{W}_a(A, ks) = \mathcal{W}^\ell_u(ks)$ (where $A_\ell$ and $\mathcal{W}^\ell_u(ks)$ are as in (8.1)-(8.2)). This will allow us to translate the conclusion below into one concerning (8.3).

Observe that by reversibility if $a \in G_A$ and $(\mathbf{w}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ is the walk performed by some walker $w \in \mathcal{W}_a(A, ks)$, then $(\mathbf{w}((k+t)s))_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ and $(\mathbf{w}((k-t)s))_{0 \leq t \leq k}$ are (independent) $s$-walks conditioned to avoid $A$, apart from at time 0. In particular, (8.3) holds for $A$ in the role of $A_\ell$ and so since $a \in G_A$

$$\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{W}_a(A, ks)|] \geq \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{W}_a(ks)|](1 - 2\mathrm{P}^{(s)}_a[T^+_A < \infty]) \geq (1 - 2e^{-4K})\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{W}_a(ks)|] = \lambda(1 - 2e^{-4K}).$$

By Poisson thinning if $a \in G_A$, then for all $k$, $|\mathcal{W}_a(A, ks)|$ has a Poisson distribution with mean at least $\lambda(1 - 2e^{-4K})$.

Using (2.2) it is easy to show that the expected number of times an $s$-walk of length at most $M$ intersects itself is at most $e^{-4K}/\lambda$, provided that $K$ is sufficiently large. Thus by Markov inequality, if $a \in G_A$ and $(\mathbf{w}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ is the walk performed by some walker $w \in \mathcal{W}_a(A, ks)$ for some $k \leq M$, then $(\mathbf{w}(ts))_{0 \leq t \leq M, t \neq k}$ visits at least $M/4 \geq 2K/\lambda$ distinct vertices with probability at least $p := 1 - \frac{1}{Ke^{4K}(1-2e^{-4K})}$ (the term $(1 - 2e^{-4K})$ in the denominator is there since instead of taking $w \in \mathcal{W}_a(ks)$ we take $w \in \mathcal{W}_a(A, ks)$, which means that the law of its walk is conditioned to be in some set of walks whose probability (w.r.t. the law of a walk of a walker in $\mathcal{W}_a(ks)$) is at least $(1 - 2e^{-4K})$.

We now denote

$$U_\ell := \{u : (u, st) \in \mathcal{U}_\ell \text{ for some } t\} \quad \text{and} \quad C_\ell := \{u : (u, st) \in \mathcal{C}_\ell \text{ for some } t\}.$$

Assume that $|A_\ell| \geq 2\ell$. Then $|G_{A_\ell}| \geq (1 - e^{-4K})2\ell > \ell$ and so $G_{A_\ell} \setminus C_\ell = G_{A_\ell} \cap U_\ell$ is non-empty. As long as this is the case, in the $\ell$-th stage we expose some $(u, st) \in \mathcal{U}_\ell$ such that $u \in G_{A_\ell} \cap U_\ell$, where the choice of $(u, st)$ is made according to some prescribed order on $V \times \mathbb{Z}_+$ (or simply according to the lexicographic order on the stage in which the walkers were discovered and their time co-ordinate). By the above analysis, provided that $K$ is sufficiently large, with probability at least $(1 - e^{-(1-2e^{-4K})\lambda})p \geq \lambda/2$, $|A_{\ell+1}| - |A_\ell| \geq 2K/\lambda$ and so

$$\mathbb{E}[|A_{\ell+1}| - |A_\ell| \mid |A_\ell| \geq 2\ell] \geq K \geq 3.$$

Combining this with Azuma inequality (applied to the Doob's martingale of $(|A_\ell|)_{\ell \geq 0}$), it is not hard to verify that with positive probability $|A_\ell| \geq 2\ell$ for all $\ell$ (c.f. the proof of Theorem 1.1 in [4]) as desired.

□

## Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Itai Benjamini for suggesting the problems studied in this paper and thank him and Gady Kozma for helpful discussions.

...

## References


[1] OSM Alves, FP Machado, and S.Y. Popov. The shape theorem for the frog model. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 12(2):533–546, 2002.

[2] Itai Benjamini. Private communication, 2012.

[3] Itai Benjamini and Jonathan Hermon. Rapid social connectivity. *Arxiv preprint. Arxiv ID arXiv:1608.07621*, 2016.

[4] Itai Benjamini, Asaf Nachmias, and Yuval Peres. Is the critical percolation probability local? *Probability theory and related fields*, 149(1-2):261–269, 2011.

[5] A Gandolfi, MS Keane, and CM Newman. Uniqueness of the infinite component in a random graph with applications to percolation and spin glasses. *Probability theory and related fields*, 92(4):511–527, 1992.

[6] Christopher Hoffman, Tobias Johnson, and Matthew Junge. Recurrence and transience for the frog model on trees. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1404.6238*, 2014.

[7] Christopher Hoffman, Tobias Johnson, and Matthew Junge. From transience to recurrence with poisson tree frogs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1501.05874*, 2015.

[8] H. Kesten and V. Sidoravicius. The spread of a rumor or infection in a moving population. *The annals of probability*, 33(6):2402–2462, 2005.

[9] David Asher Levin, Yuval Peres, and Elizabeth Lee Wilmer. *Markov chains and mixing times*. American Mathematical Soc., 2009.

[10] Russell Lyons. with y. peres. probability on trees and networks. *preparation. Current version available at http://mypage. iu. edu/˜ rdlyons/prbtree/book. pdf*, 2009.

[11] S.Y. Popov. Frogs in random environment. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 102(1):191–201, 2001.

[12] Augusto Teixeira, Johan Tykesson, et al. Random interlacements and amenability. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 23(3):923–956, 2013.

[13] A. Telcs and N.C. Wormald. Branching and tree indexed random walks on fractals. *Journal of applied probability*, 36(4):999–1011, 1999.